

Kenneth F. Eakin, Harrisville.
Annie M. Schaner, Lingelstown.
Grace E. Lovett, Trafford.

TEXAS

Samuel M. Compton, Celeste.
Ernest J. Banta, Medina.
William McGonagle Irby, Texon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Father in Heaven, by whose mercy we are permitted to greet another day, we offer Thee our tributes of praise. In Thy overflowing tenderness, hear the wordless prayers of human hearts where tears may be vindicated. Enshrined as the ideal of infinite love, as the Saviour of endless compassion, allow them not to be bowed down under the burdens of the present crisis. We rejoice that no path is wholly rough; that, though we be weary, Thou art weary, too.

From the eternal recesses of Thy mercy pour abundantly that refreshing and sustaining spirit that shall encourage all to stand as they who stand in the morning. We pray that contentions may cease and unity may become triumphantly glorious throughout our Nation. We thank Thee that behind the dim unknown standeth God within the shadows, keeping watch above His own. To the altar of prayer we bear our President, his immediate counselors, our Speaker and this entire legislative body; sanctify and bless all their deliberations. Grant that the vision of a people with one heart may inspire the nations of the earth with an invincible desire for peace. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6460) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. BEAM, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. DITTER, Mr. PLUMLEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein a letter from the President of the American Federation of Labor and a short statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent also to extend my remarks and include a copy of a resolution received from the Legislature of the State of New York addressed to the Congress of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the president of the Agricultural College of the State of North Dakota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of other business, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day today I may be allowed to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

MELVYN DOUGLAS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I note that a man now going by the name of Melvyn Douglas—old name Melvyn Hesselberg—is appointed Publicity Chief in the Office of Civilian Defense.

This is the man that public sentiment in California kept from taking a commission in the National Guard on account of his "pink" and "red" activities and his close association with subversive, communistic groups.

Do we always have to have men who have changed their names, and whose past activities are questioned, in high places in Government? Perhaps this is the reason that we constantly have to have reorganization; the reason that we get conversation, reports, and publicity statements, instead of guns, airplanes, antiaircraft, subchasers, and so forth. Do they realize in advance that the appointees who have been named are absolutely unqualified to do their work and through these departmental publicity hounds play up to our people high-sounding publicity to cover up their failures?

How do our taxpayers feel when they see our money used like this? Partisan politics are supposed to be adjourned, and I hope they are; but when our people see such men as Landis, the Bridges defender, and those who are Communists or closely associated with communism, like Cowley, Lash, and Douglas, appointed to positions in Government, you can well see why many of our people are losing confidence in the organization here in Washington.

Instead of having a thorough house cleaning of these incompetent parasites,

the program seems to be to obtain the most unqualified and the most incompetent, who always has tied up with the interests which would destroy the American form of government. If hundreds of thousands of men are lost before this war is won, it can be chargeable to the incompetent political set-up right here in Washington.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a speech delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] in Dayton, Ohio, last week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution adopted by the Pi Gamma Mu convention at New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

GARAGE RENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago there was considerable disturbance in the District of Columbia regarding rents on housing accommodations. That same trouble now has spread to garages. In several cases the increases in garage rents have been 50 percent.

On yesterday I introduced a bill that would bring within the provisions of the Rent Control Act already in force the rents for automobile storage space in both private and public garages. The Committee on the District of Columbia has started to consider this matter, and I would urge every Member of the House who has any information on the subject regarding increase of garage rents to present their facts to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

[Here the gavel fell.]

MELVYN DOUGLAS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to ask for recognition twice so quickly, but I cannot let the charges of my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] against Melvyn Douglas go unanswered.

The truth about the matter is that when an appointment was offered by the Governor of California to Mr. Douglas some years ago to take some military post he declined it and gave as his reason that he did not believe he was qualified.

The further truth about the matter is that he is not now and never has been a Communist, nor is he a friend of Communists.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; not now,

The further truth about the matter is that the Communist Party instituted a boycott against the motion picture in which he has been appearing—namely, *Ninotchka*.

The further fact is that if there is anybody who will serve with a whole heart and soul the cause of the United States at this time, I know of none who will do it better than he will.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.
Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Did he ever change his name?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not think that has anything to do with it. Most movie actors have done so, however; and I could name over dozens and dozens of people, some of the best people in the country, who have changed their names, especially if they were long ones.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Was the sentiment in California against him?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I certainly do not think the sentiment of California is against him to do the kind of job he is qualified to do.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. For his "red" activities?

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by Clarence Budington Kelland.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF AGENCIES FROM WASHINGTON

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, an uncomplimentary but rather unfair if not snide editorial appeared in yesterday's issue of the New York Herald Tribune concerning the New York City delegation. We were accused of dereliction because we failed to attend en masse a meeting called at the Mayflower Hotel last Saturday morning concerning the campaign to bring decentralized bureaus to New York City. Most of us failed or rather refused to attend because the House was not in session and most of us had gone to our homes in New York.

A sort of self-styled, self-anointed, pseudo leader of us New Yorkers called the meeting with knowledge that his colleagues would be in New York. In a measure he is responsible for the mean editorial aforesaid.

I believe in decentralization. This self-crowned pooh-bah should also be decentralized and parts sent to Tim-

buktu, Riverside Drive, and deepest Congo.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of the legislative calendar for the day and any other special orders that may have been entered I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JAMES LAWRENCE FLY

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FLYNN AND THE REPUBLICANS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, of all the whimpering, whining politicians, this Mr. Edward J. Flynn should be awarded chief place. Last night he said the Republicans were not as much interested in winning the war as they were interested in controlling the House of Representatives. That is the highest tribute that could be paid to our patriotism, because it is becoming more and more evident as the days go by that if the war is to be won the Republicans will have to get control of the House and of the executive department. Why any man who has had all this relief money to spend, much of which was taken from the poor and the unfortunate and spent for political purposes, should now let out a squawk when he has these billions appropriated for war at his disposal and when they are using them all the time for political purposes is past my understanding, unless he sees

the handwriting on the wall and realizes that the people back in the sticks are getting on to what the Democratic administration is doing with our war funds.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

LABOR TROUBLES

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some time ago this House passed what was known as the Smith bill. Immediately the membership was made the target for much abuse by the labor unions, and we were told there was no necessity for the Smith bill because labor was going to behave, the unwise and more or less radical labor leaders were going to behave.

We find on the Pacific coast today that the welders are out on strike, effectively tying up the shipbuilding defense industries out there. But, further than that, may I say this? I have before me a telegram received from the Detroit Livestock Association wherein they call my attention to the fact that the teamsters union in Detroit now threatens to tie up all the meat supply in the city of Detroit, thereby depriving 70,000 farmers of an outlet for their livestock. This food is not only furnished to the people of Detroit, but also is supplied to the soldiers and sailors in the uniform of this country.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time for this Government to stand upon its hind legs and tell these radical labor leaders where to get off before it is too late.

Read this telegram carefully and note the unsound, unfair, and totally unpatriotic un-American position assumed by this teamsters union.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include the telegram referred to in my remarks made a few minutes ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a press release from the United States Civil Service Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON]?

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6511) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman withhold that a minute?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the calling of the Private Calendar has been discontinued for the day?

The SPEAKER. The Chair saw no objectors or Members who handle these Private Calendar bills on the floor. The Chair will be glad to recognize these gentlemen.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I just wanted the information; that is all.

The SPEAKER. The Chair not seeing those Members here recognized the gentleman from Indiana. The Chair will recognize Members for the calling of bills on the Private Calendar after the present bill is disposed of.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of bills on the Private Calendar be set aside for the time being.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not intend to set aside the calling of bills on the Private Calendar by unanimous consent. The Chair previously did not see any objectors on the floor. If there is objection to this procedure, then the bills on the Private Calendar may be called.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the calling of bills on the Private Calendar is in order for today. I ask unanimous consent that the Private Calendar be called at the termination of the consideration of the Treasury and Post Office Departments' appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I thought I saw the Democratic objectors here. The Republican objectors are all here and I see at least one on the other side.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I simply make this unanimous-consent request so that we will have something before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

LXXXVIII—62

ALBERT BARRETT

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 1988, for the relief of Albert Barrett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Albert Barrett, as of August 1924, the date on which he entered the United States, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 9, insert the following: "other than that provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 875, U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (e)), requiring the exclusion of aliens who have been convicted of or who admit the commission of a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN BASQUE ALIENS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 314, for the relief of certain Basque aliens.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of Ignacio Abadia, Nampa, Idaho; Alejandro Alberdi, Boise, Idaho; Felix Achirica, Boise, Idaho; Pedro Aguirre, Shoshone, Idaho; Santiago Alegria, Boise, Idaho; Gregorio Arana, Willow Creek, Oreg.; Guillermo Armaolea, Mullan, Idaho; Ponciano Arrietta, Boise, Idaho; Pedro Arruzazabala, Boise, Idaho; Francisco Asla, Mountain Home, Idaho; Elias Asolo, Shoshone, Idaho; Bernardo Ausocoa, Boise, Idaho; Abraham Azpiri, Murphy, Idaho; Francisco Barinaga, Boise, Idaho; Martin Barrencia, Boise, Idaho; Alejandro Bilbao, Mountain Home, Idaho; Francisco Bilbao, Emmett, Idaho; Jose Bilbao, Mountain Home, Idaho; Victor Bilbao, Boise, Idaho; Arturo Calvo, Tuscarora, Nev.; Gonzalo Cortazar, Boise, Idaho; Andres Echevarrieta, Hagerman, Idaho; Antonio Echevarrieta, Hagerman, Idaho; Prudencio Elordieta, Atlanta, Idaho; Gregorio Elorriaga, Buhl, Idaho; Jose Elorriaga, Mountain Home, Idaho; Juan Elorza, Boise, Idaho; Juan Garmendia, Nampa, Idaho; Francisco Guezuraga, Boise, Idaho; Jose Guezuraga, Boise, Idaho; Enrique Ispisua, Boise, Idaho; Antonio Laradagoitia, Emmett, Idaho; Felix Larrucea, Boise, Idaho; Victor Legarreta, Jarbridge, Nev.; Juan Lejardi, Boise, Idaho; Ciriaco Lezamiz, Mountain Home, Idaho; Daniel Martinez, Boise, Idaho; Antonio Menchaca, Nampa, Idaho; Elias Mendilibar, Fresno, Calif.; Jose Antonio Mendiola, Fresno, Calif.; Claudio Murua, Shoshone, Idaho; Ignacio Naveran, Shoshone, Idaho; Victor Orbe, Boise, Idaho; Canuto Otazua, Boise, Idaho; Gregorio Otazua, Boise, Idaho; Alejandro Rementeria, Boise, Idaho; Andres Retolaza, Boise, Idaho; Pedro Juan Sengotita, Bengoa, Mountain Home, Idaho; Cristobal Sagasti, Boise, Idaho; Bernardo Torre, Gooding, Idaho; Jesus Ugalde, Emmett, Idaho; Pedro Ugalde, Boise, Idaho; Gregorio Urcaregul,

Richfield, Idaho; Francisco Uriarte, Mountain Home, Idaho; Herman Uriarte, Mountain Home, Idaho; Agustin Uribe, Mountain Home, Idaho; Feliciano Uribe, Boise, Idaho; Antonio Urquidi, Boise, Idaho; Ignacio Urtutia, Boise, Idaho; Anastasio Yrasuegui, Castleford, Idaho; Nicasio Yrazabal, Ely, Nev.; Juan Yrigoyen, Boise, Idaho; Tomas Yturbe, Mountain Home, Idaho; Angel Suarez, Boise, Idaho, legally admitted as seamen but who have remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations, and that these aliens shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of their actual entry on the payment of the visa fees of \$10 and head taxes of \$8 per person.

Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct 64 numbers from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "Ponciano Arrietta, Boise, Idaho."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "Arturo Calvo, Tuscarora, Nev."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "Felix Larrucea, Boise, Idaho."

Page 2, line 25, strike out "Pedro Ugalde, Boise, Idaho."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRANT of Indiana: On page 3, lines 15 and 16, strike out "64" and insert "60."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORRIS BURSTEIN AND JENNIE BURSTEIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2868, for the relief of Morris Burstein and Jennie Burstein.

Mr. GORE and Mr. MOTT objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

KURT G. STERN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3295, for the relief of Kurt G. Stern.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the approval of this act Kurt G. Stern shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States at Buffalo, N. Y., on February 10, 1936, as an immigrant for permanent residence and, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas, shall not be subject to deportation, by reason of any provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 8, sec. 136), on account of an act or circumstance which may have occurred prior to the date of entry into the United States of the said Kurt G. Stern. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Germany of the first year that the German quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CATHERINA MIGLIORE AND ANTHONY AND ROSE MIGLIORE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5071, for the relief of Catherina Migliore and Anthony and Rose Migliore.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the aliens, Catherina Migliore, and her son and daughter, Anthony and Rose Migliore, and is directed not to issue any further such warrants or orders in the case of such aliens, insofar as such future warrants or orders are based on any unlawful entry of such aliens into the United States prior to the enactment of this act. Furthermore that, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said aliens as of August 15, 1925, that being the approximate date on which they entered the United States at the port of New York, if they be found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws, other than those relating to quotas. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the quota for Italy, when such quota numbers become available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UMBERTO DANTA ANNIBALI

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5539, for the relief of Umberto Danta Annibali.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel the outstanding warrant of arrest issued under deportation proceedings against the alien, Umberto Danta Annibali, notwithstanding any provision of existing law. From and after the effective date of this act Umberto Danta Annibali shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the facts upon which the outstanding proceedings are based.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA AZUCENA ALVAREZ CANGA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3469, for the relief of Maria Azucena Alvarez Canga.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Maria Azucena Alvarez Canga as of September 15, 1938, the day on which she was temporarily admitted to the United States, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws, other than those relating to quotas. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper control officer to deduct

one number from the Spanish quota of the first year that the said quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLORENCE CHUMLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5954, for the relief of Florence Chumley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel the deportation order issued against Florence Chumley, and that Florence Chumley shall not hereafter be subject to deportation for the same cause or causes upon which the present order of deportation is based.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

D. H. DANTZLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4354, for the relief of D. H. Dantzier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to D. H. Dantzier the sum of \$28.55, this amount being due Mr. Dantzier for services rendered as former United States commissioner for the eastern district of South Carolina.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to D. H. Dantzier the sum of \$28.55, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for services rendered by him as a de facto United States Commissioner in the eastern district of South Carolina from December 29, 1938, to February 20, 1939, inclusive: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID B. BYRNE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4896, for the relief of David B. Byrne.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to David B. Byrne the sum of \$181.25, in full settlement of all claims against the Government for losses incurred by him as the result of

damages to personal property caused by fire while serving as a second lieutenant, in the Field Artillery School, at Fort Sill, Okla., on October 1, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "Government" and insert "United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5652, to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the employees responsible for the excess or erroneous payments represented by the sums (including interest accruals) herein stated be, and they are hereby, relieved of financial liability therefor and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of the accounts of the following-named former disbursing officers of the Veterans' Administration and Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, in such amounts not exceeding the sums (including interest accruals) stated herein which have been, or hereafter may be, disallowed as may be necessary to relieve such disbursing officers of financial liability therefor: *Provided*, That this act shall not be construed to bar recovery of the amounts herein specified from the persons to whom and through whom such amounts have been paid:

First. William H. Holmes, former disbursing officer, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sums of \$290.50, symbol 11-006; and \$6,252.19, symbol 11-348, which amounts were expended during the period from May 7, 1921, through June 30, 1929.

Second. E. E. Miller, former disbursing officer, Pension Accounts, Pension Bureau, and Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of \$2,924, which amount was expended during the period from August 16, 1926, through August 31, 1931, under symbol 62-044.

Third. J. B. Schommer, former disbursing officer, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sums of \$591.78, symbol 11-500; \$4,354.99, symbol 11-532; and \$6,915.51, symbol 11-666, which amounts were expended during the period from July 1, 1929, through June 30, 1934.

Fourth. Norma E. Hesterly, former disbursing officer, Veterans' Administration, Albuquerque, N. Mex., in the sum of \$75, which amount was expended during the period from July 1, 1933, through October 31, 1933, under symbol 11-474.

Fifth. Lawrence Levy, former disbursing officer, Veterans' Administration, Baltimore, Md., in the sum of \$57.60, which amount was expended during the period from October 1,

1934, through February 15, 1935, under symbol 11-366.

Sixth. J. W. Reynar, former disbursing officer, Veterans' Administration, Charlotte, N. C., in the sum of \$34.62, which amount was expended during the period from December 15, 1933, through May 1, 1934, under symbol 11-374.

Seventh. L. W. Looker, former disbursing officer, Veterans' Administration, Cleveland, Ohio, in the sum of \$1,177.43, which amount was expended on November 6, 1931, under symbol 99-114.

Eighth. M. V. Bates, former disbursing officer, Veterans' Administration, Detroit, Mich., in the sum of \$657.73, which amount was expended on August 25, 1932, under symbol 89-842.

Ninth. W. W. Weldon, former disbursing officer, Veterans' Administration facility, Hines, Ill., in the sum of \$18, which amount was expended on June 30, 1933, under symbol 11-521.

Tenth. N. B. Harrison (Mohen), former disbursing officer, Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif., in the sum of \$188.59, which amount was expended on January 19, 1934, under symbol 89-851.

Eleventh. P. E. Haase, former disbursing officer, Veterans' Administration, Louisville, Ky., in the sum of \$14, symbol 11-470, and \$494.69, symbol 99-130, which amounts were expended during the period from January 19, 1931, through March 31, 1935.

Twelfth. Don Iler, former disbursing officer, Veterans' Administration, New York, N. Y., in the sum of \$12.90, which amount was expended on January 26, 1932, under symbol 99-138.

Thirteenth. M. L. Morris, former disbursing officer, Veterans' Administration, Oklahoma City, Okla., in the sum of \$826.78, which amount was expended on August 11, 1932, under symbol 99-139.

Fourteenth. L. S. McCracken, former disbursing officer, Veterans' Administration, San Francisco, Calif., in the sum of \$158.52, which amount was expended on March 4, 1931, under symbol 99-151.

Fifteenth. J. William Yates, Jr., former disbursing officer, Veterans' Administration, Tuscaloosa, Ala., in the sum of \$88, which amount was expended during the period from October 1, 1934, through January 31, 1935, under symbol 11-383.

Sixteenth. G. F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, Washington, D. C., in the sums of \$486.34, symbol 11-559; \$11,291.19, symbol 11-561; \$5, symbol 11-564; \$180, symbol 11-565; \$27.79, symbol 11-566; \$5, symbol 11-568; \$147.25, symbol 11-569; \$29, symbol 11-570; \$124.84, symbol 11-571; \$108.61, symbol 11-572; \$69.40, symbol 11-573; \$60.75, symbol 11-574; \$9.75, symbol 11-576; \$4.60, symbol 11-577; \$44.50, symbol 11-578; \$2.50, symbol 11-581; \$1,041.81, symbol 11-647; \$507.57, symbol 99-287; \$1,731.10, symbol 99-280; \$377, symbol 99-282; \$100, symbol 99-283; \$787, symbol 99-284; \$305.50, symbol 99-286; \$507.57, symbol 99-287; \$1,731, symbol 99-288; \$196.38, symbol 99-289; \$619.50, symbol 99-290; \$98.50, symbol 99-292, which amounts were expended during the period from July 1, 1934, through June 30, 1940.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sums to the persons hereinafter designated.

First. Betty S. Akers, formerly temporarily employed as junior typist at Veterans' Administration facility, Mountain Home, Tenn., the sum of \$113.47, which was deducted from salary payment due her.

Second. Agnes L. Hill, formerly temporarily employed as junior stenographer at Veterans' Administration, Detroit, Mich., the sum of \$312.06, which was deducted from salary and retirement fund due her.

Third. Margaret B. Hobson, now Grim, formerly temporarily employed as stenographer at Veterans' Administration facility, Roanoke, Va., the sum of \$51.55, which was refunded by her on May 2, 1940.

Fourth. Kenneth R. Huffine, formerly temporarily employed as chauffeur at Veterans' Administration facility, Mountain Home, Tenn., the sum of \$119.21, of which cash refunds totaling \$49.98 were made by him and the balance of \$69.23 was deducted from salary payment due him for the period ending May 31, 1939.

Fifth. William V. Kamlade, formerly temporarily employed as junior stenographer at Veterans' Administration facility, Jefferson Barracks, Mo., the sum of \$48.76, which was due him as salary payment and used as an offset against the disallowance in his account.

Sixth. Milton G. Roberts, formerly temporarily employed as chauffeur at Veterans' Administration facility, Augusta, Ga., the sum of \$50.89, of which \$30 was deducted from salary payment due him for the period ending May 31, 1939, and \$20.89 recovered by cash refund.

Seventh. Ivan Sackman, formerly temporarily employed as clerk-typist at Veterans' Administration facility, Downey, Ill., the sum of \$24.77, which was deducted from salary payment due him for the period ending December 31, 1938.

Eighth. Edward J. Sinclair, formerly temporarily employed as junior stenographer at Veterans' Administration facility, Togus, Maine, the sum of \$37.04, which was refunded by him in April 1939.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 8, strike out "sum" and insert "sums."

Page 6, line 15, strike out "were" and insert "was."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUILDERS SPECIALTIES CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5865, for the relief of Builders Specialties Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100 to Builders Specialties Co., 526 Forrest Road NE., Atlanta, Ga., in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of mistake in bid for furnishing material to the Department of Justice Federal correctional institution, Tallahassee, Fla., under contract dated September 18, 1939, and purchase order No. 40-298.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 11, strike out the date "September 18, 1939" and insert in lieu thereof "September 22, 1939."

At the end of the bill strike out the period and insert "": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof

shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOWARD L. MILLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5887, for the relief of Howard L. Miller.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Howard L. Miller, of Abilene, Tex., the sum of \$2,360 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss of 222 ewes and 35 lambs which were drowned during Army maneuvers on May 20, 1941, at which time his land was being used by the United States Army troops: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

B. H. WILFORD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6226, for the relief of B. H. Wilford.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$235.99, to B. H. Wilford in full payment and satisfaction for overpayments in the foregoing amount, resulting from the application of Public Law No. 839, Seventy-sixth Congress, and Executive Order No. 8588, dated November 7, 1940, to the shipment, on December 14, 1940, of his household goods and personal effects upon change of official station: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS OF THE ARMY FOR SETTLEMENT OF INDIVIDUAL CLAIMS APPROVED BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6328, for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of the following disbursing officers of the Army of the United States the amounts set opposite their names: Lt. Col. Roy J. Caperton, Finance Department, \$16.75; Lt. Col. Walter D. Dabney, Finance Department, \$69.24; Maj. E. H. deSaussure (Cavalry), Finance Department, \$15.60; Maj. John R. Gilchrist, Finance Department, \$254.90; Lt. Col. Leo L. Gocker, Finance Department, \$10; Lt. Col. William S. Keller, Finance Department, \$295.06; Col. Montgomery T. Legg, Finance Department, \$70; Lt. Col. Clarence B. Lindner, Finance Department, \$23; Lt. Col. Emmet C. Morton, Finance Department (now retired), \$132.18; Capt. E. A. Muth, Finance Reserve, \$5; Lt. Col. Sidney C. Page, Finance Department, \$35; Lt. Col. Frank E. Parker (deceased), Finance Department, \$123.22; Maj. Florio J. Stagliano, Finance Department, \$13.27; Lt. Col. Wallace C. Steiger, Finance Department, \$13; Lt. Col. Thomas P. Walsh, Finance Department, \$115.10; Lt. Col. Hugh Whitt, Finance Department, \$42.60; Lt. Col. Stephen R. Beard, Finance Department, \$3,168.22; and Lt. Col. Eugene M. Foster, Finance Department, \$268.23; the said amounts representing erroneous payments of public funds for which these officers are accountable, such erroneous payments having resulted from minor errors in the computations of pay and allowances due former members of the Civilian Conservation Corps, former members of the Army of the United States, civilian employees, and commercial firms or individuals from whom collection of the overpayments cannot be effected, and which amounts have been disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. Charles K. McAllister, Finance Department, the sum of \$1,222, public funds for which he is accountable, which were stolen from the safe of his agent officer, Wray F. Sagaser, at Civilian Conservation Corps Company 794, Ogden Bay Refuge BS-2, near Hooper, Utah, by a person or persons unknown: *Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be charged to the said Wray F. Sagaser.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Staff Sgt. James A. Matlock the amount of \$78.50, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount refunded by him on account of a payment previously made to him: *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable on account of the above-mentioned payment.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maj. Harold T. Molloy (Field Artillery), Quartermaster Corps, the amount of \$23.65, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount paid by him to make good the loss of public funds for which he was responsible as sales officer at Vancouver Barracks, Washington, and which public funds were stolen by the cashier, sales office, an enlisted man.

SEC. 5. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. Irvin V. Todd, Finance Department (deceased), the sum of \$57.85, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing erroneous payments resulting from minor errors in the computation of pay and allowances due to three former members of the Civilian Conservation Corps and a member of the Officers' Reserve Corps.

SEC. 6. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized

and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. William H. Kasten, Finance Department, in the sum of \$14.50, public funds for which he is accountable, which sum was paid by him to members of the Civilian Conservation Corps on vouchers subsequently determined to have been issued for services improperly ordered by a camp superintendent.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REV. JULIUS PAAL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1374, to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Labor be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal, who entered the United States at New York on October 5, 1937, and that he shall, for all purposes under the immigration and naturalization laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted as an immigrant for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall direct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Hungarian quota for the first year said Hungarian quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL HEATING CO., WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2980, for the relief of National Heating Co., Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon satisfactory completion by National Heating Co., Washington, D. C., of its contract with the United States for the construction for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics of a central heating plant at Langley Field, Va. (N. A. C. A. contract-NAW 876, requisition 47), the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said National Heating Co., the sum of \$10,000. A typographical error in connection with the submission of the bid of the said National Heating Co. for such construction caused such bid to be \$10,000 less than it should have been, and if such typographical error had not been made, the bid of the said National Heating Co. for such construction would still have been the lowest bid therefor by \$2,600.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to the National Heating Co., of Washington, D. C., the sum of \$8,613.93 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses occasioned by a typographical error made in connection with the submission of a bid for the construction of a central heating plant at Langley Field, Va., with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (N. A. C. A. contract-NAW 876, requisition 47): *Provided*, That no part of the amount ap-

propriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT L. DEMUTH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4409, granting jurisdiction to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit to reopen and readjudicate the case of Robert L. Demuth.

Mr. GORE and Mr. MOTT objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

BLANCHE E. BROAD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4524) for the relief of Blanche E. Broad.

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. MOTT objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

FLOYD P. MORITZKY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4657) for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Floyd P. Moritzky, of Coffeyville, Kans., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States, for personal injuries sustained on September 18, 1936, when an Army truck in which he was an authorized passenger crashed into a tree while en route to Fort Riley, Kans.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$4,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAX GEISSLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5816) for the relief of Max Geissler.

Mr. GORE and Mr. MOTT objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

ROY F. LASSLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5857) for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former

acting chief disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior, and G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Roy F. Lassly, former acting chief disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior, the sum of \$7,533.50, and in the accounts of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, the sum of \$20,012.20, public funds for which they are accountable, and which were paid by them on fraudulent vouchers prepared by a trusted employee of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MASON C. BRUNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6145) for the relief of Mason C. Brunson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mason C. Brunson, Florence, S. C., the sum of \$352.70. Such sum represents the amount of fees earned by the said Mason C. Brunson for services rendered as United States commissioner, eastern district of South Carolina, during a portion of the quarter ending July 31, 1939, but not paid because the account covering such services was not rendered within the time prescribed by law.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$352.70" and insert "\$292.05."

At the end of the bill strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PORTLAND SPORTWEAR MANUFACTURING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1523) for the relief of the Portland Sportwear Manufacturing Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to release the Portland Sportwear Manufacturing Co., of Portland, Oreg.,

from its obligation to pay all excess costs resulting from the purchase in the open market of certain coats on account of the failure of such company to perform contract No. W-669-qm-CIV-462 after its bid, dated November 23, 1940, had been accepted.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to such Portland Sportwear Manufacturing Co. a sum equal to the total sum of any amounts paid by it in payment of such excess costs.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

WILLARD R. CENTERWALL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2011) for the relief of Willard R. Centerwall, formerly superintendent and special disbursing agent at the Tongue River Indian Agency.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to allow credit in the official accounts of Willard R. Centerwall, formerly superintendent and special disbursing agent at the Tongue River Indian Agency, for disallowances in the amounts of \$26.82 and \$11.53 under certificates of settlement of accounts by the General Accounting Office Nos. G-108840-Ind and H-5451-Ind dated December 1, 1938, and June 5, 1940, respectively.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to refund out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated any payments made by the said Willard R. Centerwall on account of the disallowances in question.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

JOHN HUFF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2430) for the relief of John Huff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Huff, of Yardville, N. J., the sum of \$5,000, in full satisfaction of his claims, and those of his wife, Ertha Huff, and his daughter, Vivian Huff, against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by them when their automobile was struck by an automobile of the War Department operated by Robert Fay, private, an enlisted man of the United States Army, on May 13, 1939, at the intersection of the Clarksville-Mercerville Road (Quaker Bridge Road) and State Highway No. 33 (Nottingham Way), Mercerville, N. J.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Sec. 2. Payment shall not be made under this act until the said John Huff has released, in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of

the Treasury, any judgment or other claim arising out of such accident which he may have against the said Robert Fay.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINNIE C. SANDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3610) for the relief of Minnie C. Sanders and Henry G. Sanders, her husband.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Minnie C. Sanders, of the township of Union, Union County, N. J., the sum of \$5,000, and to Henry G. Sanders, her husband, the sum of \$1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Minnie C. Sanders in an accident at West Point, N. Y., Military Reservation, on June 5, 1940, caused by the negligent operation of a truck and motorcycle, property of the United States, and being operated by its agents: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$5,000, and to Henry G. Sanders, her husband, the sum of \$1,500" and insert "\$3,000."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "caused by the negligent operation of a truck and motorcycle, property of the United States, and being operated by its agents," and insert "when she was struck by an Army motorcycle."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Minnie C. Sanders."

HENRIETTA MORITZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4303) for the relief of Henrietta Moritz.

Mr. MOTT, Mr. GORE, and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and the bill was recommended to the Committee on Claims.

JULIA PETERSON MILLS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5048, for the relief of Julia Peterson Mills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE and Mr. GRANT of Indiana objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

NELL MAHONEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5478, for the relief of Nell Mahoney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to remove from the records of his office the debt which has been raised therein against Nell Mahoney, junior clerk-typist, Houston County, Tex., Rural Rehabilitation office of the Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture, at Crockett, Tex., in the sum of \$125.75, together with interest due thereon from date of loss, public funds for which she is accountable and which were stolen from her desk in the Houston County Rural Rehabilitation office, Crockett, Tex., without her fault, on September 18, 1940.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARRIS ISLAND HURRICANE AND FLOOD: REIMBURSEMENT TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5572, to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I object. There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$1,136.66, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, Capt. Peter A. McDonald, United States Marine Corps, for the value of personal property lost or damaged in the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, IDAHO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6225, for the relief of certain individuals

in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project, Idaho.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the acts of June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 1363), June 11, 1940 (Private, No. 362, 76th Cong.), and June 25, 1941 (Private, No. 121, 77th Cong.), for the relief of certain individuals named therein in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project, Idaho, are hereby supplemented and further amended by authorizing and directing payment as therein provided, out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, of the following amounts in lieu of the amounts provided for in the said act of June 20, 1938, to the individuals named: C. E. and Leonard R. Stedman, \$347; J. S. Bowker and J. L. Wilson, \$150; L. E. Winschell, \$150; Richard Torgensen, \$500; and W. James Chester, \$500: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARMELLA RIDGEWELL

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 806, for the relief of Carmella Ridgewell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carmella Ridgewell, of Providence, R. I., the sum of \$1,200.50, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for damages for personal injuries, medical expenses, and property damage sustained by her when the car which she was driving was struck by a truck owned by the United States Government and operated by G. Kazmirchuk, an employee of the National Youth Administration, at Campton, N. H., on July 17, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ETTA HOUSER FREEMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1266, conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Etta Houser Freeman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. GRANT of Indiana, and Mr. MOTT objected, and, under

the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MERCHANTS DISTILLING CORPORATION

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1654, for the relief of the Merchants Distilling Corporation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Merchants Distilling Corporation, of Terre Haute, Ind., the sum of \$4,154.62, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for a refund of the tax assessed and paid on two thousand and seventy-seven and thirty-one one-hundredths proof gallons of distilled spirits lost in the process of manufacture on March 25, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THURSTON AND HARDY, A PARTNERSHIP

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1771, for the relief of R. V. Thurston and Joseph Hardy, a partnership.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to R. V. Thurston and Joseph Hardy, a partnership, the sum of \$3,600 in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for the settlement of its war minerals relief claim (claim No. 940, under the act of June 30, 1936), the award of such sum to such partnership having been recommended on February 11, 1941, by the commissioner by whom such claim was considered and having been disallowed by the Secretary of the Interior on the ground that having previously made an award to such partnership under such act he was technically without authority to make the additional award recommended by the commissioner: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LESLIE TRUAX

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1778, for the relief of Leslie Truax.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Les-

He Truax, the sum of \$1,000, in full settlement of any and all claims against the United States for injuries sustained on July 9, 1935, while a member of Battery A of the Citizens' Military Training Corps at Fort Snelling, Minn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. HUGH G. NICHOLSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1848, for the relief of Dr. Hugh G. Nicholson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. Hugh G. Nicholson, the sum of \$3,300, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for medical services rendered to the Indians of Alaska from June 5, 1929, to January 8, 1935: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS HOWARD ROBINSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1974, for the relief of Francis Howard Robinson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$246.20 to reimburse Francis Howard Robinson, radioman first class, United States Navy, for the value of personal property lost or damaged in the fire in Government quarters occupied by him at United States naval radio station, Astoria, Oreg., on September 22, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARCEL M. ROMAN ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 381, for the relief of Marcel M. Roman, Clara M. Roman, and Rodica E. Roman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Marcel M. Roman, his wife, Clara M. Roman, and daughter, Rodica E. Roman, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on May 1, 1939, the date the said Marcel M. Roman, Clara M. Roman, and Rodica E. Roman were admitted to the United States for temporary residence.

Sec. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available Rumanian immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAX DELFINER AND HIS WIFE EVY (EWA)

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3036, for the relief of Max Delfiner and his wife Evy (Ewa).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. GRANT of Indiana objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further call of the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6511) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6511, with Mr. BOEHNE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under previous order of the House, there remains 1 hour of general debate, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] and one-half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY].

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, on last Saturday, a luncheon was given at Washington's most exclusive hotel, the Mayflower, by some New Yorkers for the Senators and Representatives from New York City. Because

only four Representatives attended that luncheon the New York Herald Tribune in a screeching editorial on Monday and the Daily Mirror, today in a petulant editorial took all the Members, from New York City, to task for their failure to attend the luncheon and their failure to have more Government offices moved from Washington to New York City.

Certainly, no Member of Congress objects to fair criticism but on the face of it this newspaper tirade and the threatening speeches made at the luncheon are unfair and misleading.

Since when has a refusal by a Member of Congress to attend a luncheon, given by a pressure group, been classified as a w. o. l. and the basis for censure by the press? Do the editors of the New York Herald Tribune and the Daily Mirror attend every excursion to which they are summoned? I think not, and properly so.

I am not going to read those editorials because they are so silly. It is hard to believe that editorial writers have time for such nonsense. They tell us, both the press and the pressure groups, that all the New York City Congressmen must do in order to obtain Government departments is to demand them from the President. Some of us have made many requests on behalf of New York City and I am happy to report, with fair success. However, there are other cities equally insistent and, deserving of consideration.

It might be well to examine the record on the subject of decentralization. On September 26, 1940, I presented to the House, and it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a copy of the report entitled "Report on Industrial Mobilization" prepared by one of our leading hotel men, Mr. Martin Sweeney. This report, submitted to Mayor LaGuardia, contained plans for decentralization of Government bureaus and suggested that various Government offices be moved to the city of New York for reasons of efficiency and economy. That was not last Saturday or last week but 15 months ago. Copies of the report were sent to every bureau chief in Washington. It was a concise, intelligent, and constructive document.

As a result of the Sweeney report, the mayor established a New York City Department of Commerce. The department is composed of our leading businessmen, serving without compensation. They, in turn, recruited from the ranks of our business organizations, many expert and talented men. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. donated the services of a real-estate expert and the National City Bank and Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank did likewise. These volunteers, at great expense and considerable time compiled an elaborate report, listing every foot of office space available, in our city, for Government rental. The transit facilities, housing, and all other data necessary to arrive at an intelligent decision, were cataloged. That report was brought to Washington, and copies were delivered to the department heads and the President.

In company with these representatives of the Department of Commerce of New York City, I visited many departments, and as a result of our presentation many bureaus have been moved to New York.

Our visitors of last Saturday are not satisfied with that record of accomplishment. They seem to want all Government departments for New York City. I am afraid they are a bit overzealous.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 15, 1941, and of June 3, 1941, contains further evidence of my activity on behalf of New York City in the matter of Government office space.

On last Thursday I had the pleasure of addressing a meeting of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, held in the Woolworth Building. At that meeting there were representatives of the restaurants, hotels, banks, insurance companies, and other business organizations. This problem has been of special concern to them, and they have been working hard with good results to obtain consideration for New York. The meeting was conducted on a high plane, and I feel sure that they will achieve their objectives.

This group that came down to Washington on Saturday and arranged an elaborate luncheon apparently are hard to please, or just refuse to be satisfied with our efforts. Because many of the Members from New York City took advantage of the House being in recess to return to their districts to visit with their families and constituents, they are politically doomed, as witness the words of one speaker, "We got the brush-off, and we ought to remember it next November in political action."

Mr. Chairman, that statement coming from a business group is unpardonable. The four Representatives that attended the luncheon on Saturday are all distinguished Members of our delegation, but I am surprised that even that number were present. Holding a meeting in Washington on a Saturday afternoon when the Congress is in recess is the least propitious time to hold an important meeting. Many of us feel it is necessary for the convenience of our constituents that we return home at every opportunity. Our constituents cannot afford the expense to come to Washington to see us, so we reverse the order and go home to see them.

Perhaps these good folks took their cue from a young newspaper writer on a New York paper. He said, "I will tell you what to do. Make these New York Congressmen and Senators do what the Congressman from Virginia did in order to get the Patent Office. The entire Virginia delegation, headed by Senator GLASS, went down and shook their fists in the face of the President and demanded that the State of Virginia be the State to which the Patent Office be moved. As a result of their demand the President sent the Patent Office to Richmond."

But this reporter did not tell all the facts in the case. Maybe the Senators and Representatives from Virginia did go to the President, but I doubt it. If the Patent Office had been sent to New York

many patent lawyers of the country would have been disqualified to practice under the laws of New York State, but that hardship means nothing to some people. It would have been a gross injustice, and for that reason I am glad it went to Virginia.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. May I say it was due in great measure to the efforts of the gentleman who is now addressing the House and several other Members of the New York delegation, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK] and myself, that induced the authorities to bring the Wage and Hour Division to New York and to bring several years ago the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and several other branches of Government up there. The newspapers made no mention of the efforts of the New York City delegation in that regard.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I agree with my colleague. Every Representative from New York City has worked hard on this proposition.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I want to make this observation with regard to the luncheon meeting of last Saturday. It happened that I was one of the four Members of Congress from New York City who were present.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. By the way, the editorial to which I referred devoted considerable space to the praises of the gentleman. The gentleman deserves the praise and I am glad to bring the matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. The observation I wish to make is for the benefit of our colleagues who were not present. As my colleague [Mr. FITZPATRICK] will bear me out, every one of us who were present went to great lengths and took great pains in defending the absent Members against the statements and insinuations that they were laying down on the job, or being indifferent.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. We know full well that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY] who now has the floor, as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and the other Members of the New York delegation, have been intensely interested in furthering the cause of our home city of New York in this important matter. Within the limitations of time permitted to Members of Congress in these trying days, with the tremendous pressure of work on all of us and the demands on one's time, we know that you gentlemen have been right in the traces along with us. I want you to know that you had friends at court last Saturday and that we did our utmost to make all of these

gentlemen from New York realize that. At that meeting there was a fine cross section of the business life of New York and we were glad to have the delegation come down here. We who were present tried to make them understand your viewpoint and to impress on them that you were at the meeting quite heartily in spirit, and that every member of the New York City delegation could be depended on to work hand in glove with us.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I appreciate what the gentleman has to say, but I shall be content to let the record speak for me.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a letter from T. J. Miley, secretary of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, thanking me for my work along this line.

I never quarrel with a newspaper and I always welcome fair criticism. I think criticism is necessary, but we should have constructive, intelligent, and impartial criticism, not merely selfish views expressed in sharp language.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I realize that the gentleman from New York and the other Members from New York City have tried to get everything up there that they can. I think it is probably a good thing that the Government did not move these Government offices to New York because the rents are too high up there. You should not be blamed because you are trying to help the Government. If you will try to keep the Government agencies and offices in cities where there is not such great expense, you will be doing the country more good than anything else you can do. The people of New York should not criticize you because they are complaining about taxes now.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I do not agree with the gentleman's statement as to high rents, because office space in my city is being offered at the lowest rates for equivalent facilities of any city in the country.

I want the record to show that every Member from New York has made some effort during the past 2 years to get Government offices for New York. I should also like to send a message back to this committee, of last Saturday, that they are following a wrong course. Instead of inspiring our membership to greater accomplishments they have had the opposite effect.

I understand that the final decision as to who shall move out of Washington is made by the President because of the human problems involved. Many of the families whose children are going to school and who have built homes in which they have invested their life savings, must be considered.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I have been asked by one of my colleagues to read a resolution that was submitted to

him at the Saturday afternoon luncheon. It reads as follows:

Congress should insist upon the decentralization of Washington at once, ordering the transfer of such departments and agencies not connected with the war to New York City.

The only place that sort of a resolution might be adopted would be at a meeting of the Real Estate Owners Association. Surely no one with the intelligence of a child would offer it in the Congress of the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, to start with, may I say that I regret that I was not able to attend the hearings very generally on this bill? I am pretty familiar with it from past experience and from going over the hearings that have been held, but the members of the committee, headed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] and including amongst its minority members the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], have covered the ground pretty thoroughly on the floor here.

There are three or four outstanding matters in the bill to which I should like to call your attention. The first item is the one to which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] referred so effectively yesterday, an item of \$250,000 for the Bureau of Accounts in the Treasury Department, set up by Executive Order No. 8512. This Executive order delegates duties to the Bureau of Accounts which are a direct contradiction of section 309 of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

Section 309 states:

The Comptroller General shall prescribe the forms, systems, and procedure for administrative appropriation and fund accounting in the several departments and establishments, and for the administrative examination of fiscal officers' accounts and claims against the United States.

The Bureau of Accounts proposes under that Executive order, if they are given this money, amongst other things, to prescribe uniform terminology, standards, and classifications for use by all agencies of the Government, including corporations; and, second, to have all Federal agencies, including corporations, submit periodic financial reports to the Treasury in accordance with prescribed standards.

The foregoing appears on page 113 of the justification.

That is a direct duplication of the work laid down in the law for the Comptroller General and would result, if it were held valid, which I do not believe it would be, in two agencies prescribing the forms and terminology of the accounts which our departments would keep. That is a most ridiculous situation, and must be avoided. The Comptroller General has that job. It is necessary if he is to preserve his independence that he be permitted to retain that job. It is necessary if the Congress is to preserve its independence that it be permitted to see that the Comptroller General does retain that job.

There is no information they cannot get if they want it. I have heard peo-

ple say that the Bureau of Accounts could not tell what a battleship costs. It is not supposed to. The Navy Department is the agency that is supposed to tell what a battleship costs, and they can tell.

I feel a little more strongly about this matter than do some of the others because I was on the first reorganization committee and heard the report of the commission that was headed by Dr. Brownlow and which included a lot of other men who had not had very much experience in the operations of the Government. I heard them tell how they wanted to take away most of the authority from the Comptroller General and put it into the Bureau of Accounts. A proposal such as this makes me feel that the spectre of Dr. Brownlow is again creeping up on the authority of the Comptroller General. I do not want to see that done. So much for that. I am certain that if the Comptroller General were asked by the Bureau of Accounts or the Budget to prescribe any definite form of accounts that they might want to be kept that was within reason and was intelligent, the Comptroller General would do the job.

There are one or two items in the bill that I think have been treated pretty liberally. I, frankly, think that the Bureau of Internal Revenue has been given more money than it should have been given. It has been given an increase of over \$8,000,000. I appreciate the problems they have to face. On the other hand, my own experience with them leads me to the irresistible conclusion that they have absorbed help down there faster than they have been able to train them and put them to work effectively and that this has resulted in a very considerable amount of inefficiency. If they are slowed down somewhat their morale, I believe, would be improved.

I have very grave doubt if the number of inspectors that has been allowed the Post Office Department is justified, but, as a whole, I think the committee has done a pretty fair job in regulating the size of the operations and putting them in line with what the real requirements of the different bureaus and departments are.

This bill actually calls for practically \$6,000,000,000, although the direct appropriations are only \$1,100,000,000-plus. But the permanent appropriations that run along with it run \$4,750,000,000, according to the way it was figured out at the time the Budget estimate was prepared and, currently, I believe they would run a couple of hundred million dollars more than that. It is a very important bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Now, there are some things in connection with the Post Office operations that I think should be called to the country's attention. I am not opposed to air mail, but I do not like to see folks running around telling that the air-mail operation is nearly self-sustaining. You know you pay 6 cents for air mail, and it is handled in the Post Office the same as other mail. A good many times it has a

stretch of railroad travel and almost always it has a stretch of truck travel, and when they come to figure up the cost of air mail they do not include any of the ordinary operations of handling first-class postage. They just include the special contracts that are made for flying the mail and credit the whole 6 cents to the receipts. So, really, they give no picture such as a cost accountant would give if he went over the figures. We are a good ways from making it pay. I do not know that we will ever be able to make it pay, but that is no reason why we should not have it, although I just do not like to see the people fool themselves in the matter.

I do not propose to take any further time. I think I have been talking long enough. With what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] has said to you and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], I think the record shows a pretty fair picture of what the situations are that are involved in this bill, and I hope, as the bill is read, you will give it your earnest consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to pay my respects to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], for the very fine work that he and the other members of the committee have done and for the time and attention they have given to this bill. They certainly deserve credit for the fine work they have done on this bill.

This bill for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, as most Members believe it to be, is for \$1,112,926,000. This is an increase of \$25,604,000 over last year, but when you consider the testimony of the Treasury Department you will find that they are coming back here for many millions of dollars more for carrying on the work of the Treasury Department on account of the enormous amount of war work that is being carried on, as well as the sale of bonds and things of that kind that enter into the total cost of the operation of the Post Office and Treasury Departments. So the deficiency bills will carry large additional appropriations for the Post Office and Treasury Departments.

As to the permanent appropriations of the Treasury Department we will just take two items which are additional to the amounts I read a few moments ago. For the interest on the public debt they are now asking \$1,450,000,000, and we were told that before the year is over they will ask for \$300,000,000 additional, making a great increase in the interest paid on the national debt. The unemployment trust fund in this bill amounts to \$1,413,351,043. That makes the sum total of the bill at the present time \$5,879,000,000, a vast sum of money, and just think, we are taking 2 days' time to put a bill of this kind through. Last week a bill for nineteen billion went through the House in 3 hours.

Let us look at some of the items in the bill. The item for the deficit in the Post Office Department for 1939 was

\$40,167,244; in 1940 the deficit of the Post Office Department amounted to \$41,358,783; the deficit for 1941 was \$26,963,681. Some people think that we are going to have a balanced budget in the Post Office Department this year, but I do not think that will be the case. Let us review for a moment some of the things that have happened in the past few years with reference to the Post Office Department. The question was asked Secretary Walker about the discontinuance of the 3-cent postage. We know that in 1933 the 3-cent postage was placed on letters in order to get \$100,000,000 to pay for some of the expenses of government at that time, and that was supposed to be used as a credit to the Treasury, but since that time you have passed so many laws in the Post Office Department that we have used up not only the \$115,000,000 but we still were in the red in the Post Office Department last year to the amount of \$17,414,000. We asked Secretary Walker with reference to the continuance of the 3-cent postage, and I quote from his remarks:

A continuance of the 3-cent rate is necessary, because if it was reduced to 2 cents, taking the 1940 figures, the revenues on first-class mail would be \$110,000,000 less; the postal deficit of \$42,000,000 would be increased to \$152,000,000. That is for 1940.

Then the question was asked about balancing the budget in the Post Office Department. I do not think we are going to balance it, and neither does Mr. Walker, and I quote from his testimony on page 27 of the hearings:

I do not want to disagree with the estimates, but when it is indicated that we may have a surplus in 1943, I am very dubious, because costs are mounting. Our costs are not reflected immediately, along with our revenues. Our revenues are coming at a high figure, but our costs will not be reflected for 3, 4, or 6 months later.

So that when we talk about getting a balanced budget in the Post Office Department, the Secretary did not think so, and from the results that I have seen in the last 10 years in watching the Post Office Department, and the other branches of this Government, I do not expect that to happen.

Another thing that increases the cost of this bill is the salary increases under the Ramspeck Act, and the new appropriations that are necessary for the Treasury promotions for this year amount to \$2,402,949, and for the Post Office Department, \$847,221, or a promotion increase amounting to \$3,250,170. That is a very large sum, and it is going to be necessary for the taxpayers now to make up this difference because of the increased salaries of the Post Office employees and the Treasury Department employees.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I have not the time right now. If I get additional time I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman. I say to the Members of the House that it is going to be necessary for us to buckle up our belts and do something different from what we have been doing. We have to

learn to say "No" in Congress, because we are going to be asked and have been asked for all kinds of legislation that means more money, something for somebody back home, and so forth.

Just let me review the legislation that has been passed so far as appropriations are concerned since January 3, 1942. There is the independent offices appropriation bill amounting to \$2,100,000,000, than for the airplanes bill you have appropriated \$12,556,000,000, \$4,000,000,000 the President can give away, and for the Navy you passed a bill in the House appropriating some \$19,000,000,000, and I understand it is going to conference now and will amount, since the Senate has had it, to \$25,500,000,000. When that bill comes back to the House, certainly some consideration by the House of Representatives ought to be given to the additional \$5,000,000,000 added to that bill. Then we have this bill with permanent appropriations amounting to \$5,879,000,000, or a total of appropriations since the 3d of January of \$46,045,000,000, a sum unequaled in the history of the world by any legislative body in making appropriations. What worries me is whether we are going to be able to stand it. Will we break down financially? Here we are in war, and it is going to be necessary for us to economize, and with the recommendations that have been made to Congress every man here is responsible to cut down these appropriation bills everywhere he can, because, God knows, legitimate criticism now is the best thing that we can do to help win this war, to help our country. Unless we can get that kind of criticism we are lost as sure as the sun rises tomorrow morning.

I cannot help but take the recommendation made by Mr. Morgenthau to the Byrd committee. I would like to have you all read his recommendations which were made on Friday, the 14th of November, 1941, of economies suggested by him, so that eventually when certain bills come before the House you will be able to cut down; many of the appropriations are yet to come before this body. The President, in his address, enumerated a number of items where we could cut down for the year. You should review these recommendations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. I would like to have you take that Byrd committee report and look at the recommendations they have made of a number of things which could be cut out of the appropriations that are going to come before us this year. For your information I am going to read a few of them.

Civilian Conservation Corps, abolished, with a saving of \$246,960,000.

National Youth Administration, abolished, with a saving of \$91,767,000.

W. P. A., cut down at least \$400,000,000.

Farm-tenant program, abolished, with a saving of \$7,122,000.

Farm Security Administration, abolished, with a saving of \$70,500,000.

The committee also make a great many recommendations for the deferment of public building for nondefense purposes; deferment of Department of the Interior items; deferment of rivers and harbors and flood-control propositions.

You know you will be requested to pass some of those bills. It is terrible, in my judgment, if you even give serious consideration to them; they should be deferred for the duration.

Here you can save a billion dollars. Will you do it? If anyone believes that a billion dollars is chicken feed, just paraphrase Winston Churchill, "Some chicken; some feed!" At \$2.50 per bag of 100 pounds, \$1,000,000,000 will buy 400,000,000 bags of feed, enough to feed a flock of chickens for 4,000,000,000 weeks, or 76,900 years. I say "some chicken feed!"

Now, just remember that you are dealing with the taxpayers of America. You are going to have placed upon them greater burdens by increasing their taxes. When your people pay their taxes on the 15th of March they are going to find out it is the greatest burden that has ever been placed upon them; but I say to the American taxpayers they have seen nothing yet. Wait until you get through with them this year with new taxes. Then their backs will bend and they will have a difficult time making ends meet. Taxes—more taxes are yours to come.

That is not all. The greatest danger is the bankruptcy of the American Nation. If the American Nation goes bankrupt what good is a 7,000,000 army? What good is a two-ocean navy going to be? What is the use of having all these things prepared to do a job that is necessary to do, that is, to put these yellow-bellied Japs where they ought to be put, if this Nation goes bankrupt? It is your duty and my duty to cut down these expenses all we can, to preserve the security of a nation that is built on a sound financial policy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK].

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I tried to get the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] to yield to me for a question. The gentleman from Pennsylvania speaks about economy and where we can save some money, and he criticizes the Post Office Department for some of its extravagance.

On page 114 of the annual report of the Postmaster General for 1940, you will find according to his report that the Government lost \$85,381,026.63 on second-class mail. On third-class mail, \$26,291,985.68 was lost.

On fourth class mail \$21,809,869.92, or a total of \$133,482,832.23.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I expected my distinguished friend from New York to call attention to second-class mail, as he usually does. I call his attention to Secretary Morgenthau's statement—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Now, are you going to give me the figures of the Postmaster General, as stated in his annual report?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am going to give the figures in Secretary Morgenthau's statement.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I refuse to yield for that, because I am giving the facts and figures from the annual reports of the Postmaster General for 1940 and 1941.

In 1941, on second-class mail, the Government lost \$83,519,746.30; on third-class mail, \$22,325,181.15; on fourth-class mail, \$19,092,069.41; or a total of \$124,936,996.86.

Should we not stop giving subsidies to the second-, third-, and fourth-class mail and save the taxpayers some money? About a billion dollars has been given away in the last 8 years.

Mr. RICH. If you will put in a bill here, and the administration will foster it, you will find the Republicans will vote for it. I will be the first one to vote for it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Amendments have been offered on different occasions, but have always been rejected by the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. And from another angle there is something more than dollar values, there are human values not only in life but in government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absolutely; but some of our Members cannot see it that way. I doubt if there is any department in the Federal Government that is handled with more efficiency than the Post Office. In my opinion, the postal employees are a patriotic and loyal group of workers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York declined to yield, for I wanted to give him a little new light from testimony of Secretary Morgenthau during the consideration of this bill in the committee. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], had asked:

But you do not think there is anywhere in the estimate a place where you could cut down with safety?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. I think they have cut it in a number of instances.

Then the Secretary called attention to new duties and activities and said:

Take the item of Defense Savings bonds. It appears we have been running on a shoestring. I mean by that our sales costs are so far extremely low; and if it were not for the wonderful contributions we get from the newspapers, the public could not begin to get the information for anything like the cost.

The fact is that the Government is the greatest free rider of any agency in the country that is seeking to reach the public. It puts out press releases by the

millions of dollars' worth and piles them on the desk of newspaper editors.

Secretary Morgenthau's testimony is that if it were not for the services of the newspapers they could not begin to get the information on the Defense bond program across as they have. What the gentleman calls subsidy of second-class mail is the best investment the Government makes.

And possibly the gentleman noticed the other day that here in Washington 2 or 3 days before the dead line for the acquiring of car use stamps there were 130,000 cars without them; yet the newspapers without a cent of cost to the Government put in a few items about it, and the day following the dead line reported that 190,000 of those stamps had been purchased. In a democracy there is no substitute for the spreading of public information. This Government gets dividends a hundred times over for its encouragement of newspapers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has 10 minutes remaining, the gentleman from New York 3 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I endeavored to indicate the difficulty that confronts the Appropriations Committee in its effort to reduce the expenditures for these two departments of Government. I called specific attention to a number of instances as disclosed by this appropriation bill where the hands of the committee are tied by prior legislative enactments that make necessary the expenditure of much of the money that is proposed to be appropriated. I wanted to call attention to one matter that was brought to the attention of the committee by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] in his examination of Mr. Purdum. It relates to the compensation paid by the Government for the transportation of domestic air mail. In the Budget estimate in this bill is an item of twenty-three million five hundred and twelve thousand-odd dollars to be used to compensate domestic air-mail companies for the carrying of domestic air mail. The question arises: Is this a fair figure? Is it an exorbitant figure? Or is it an understatement that may result in a deficiency? Could this item be reduced or eliminated? The facts are that neither the Post Office Department nor the Appropriations Committee has any control over that particular item except that the Congress may act in the matter of curtailing the expansion of the domestic air-mail service or curtail the number of domestic air-mail flights. If, however, we want the service and want to see the service expanded we must pay for

it, but we have no voice in the question as to how much we shall pay. Congress has placed the responsibility for determining the compensation to domestic air-line companies in the hands of the Civil Aeronautics Authority the same as it has placed in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission the question as to the rates that shall be paid to the railroad companies for their handling of the mail. Is it not therefore clear that when criticism is directed at this committee or the Congress because of its failure to reduce these expenditures, a simple survey of the facts indicates that our hands are frequently tied by prior legislative enactments. It should be perfectly clear that the only way this item can be reduced therefore is to have the C. A. A. reduce the rates or eliminate or curtail the service. To eliminate or destroy this fundamental service would be a tragic blow to the effective and speedy handling of the mail. I feel sure that the public who pay the bills for postal service would resist any such proposal.

I want to direct your attention to the fact that the evidence disclosed in connection with the payment of compensation for carrying domestic air mail that Mr. Purdum testified they have tried repeatedly and repeatedly to get the Civil Aeronautics Authority to make a reinvestigation of the adequacy or inadequacy of these rates, and whether or not overcharges are being paid which result in the accumulation of huge profits for the air-line companies carrying domestic air mail. The same comment might also apply to those that are carrying foreign mail in the foreign air-mail service.

The facts indicate that the Civil Aeronautics Authority fixes the rate and, despite the fact that we have had tremendous increases in the number of flights and tremendous increases in the whole transportation of mail by air, the Civil Aeronautics Authority, in my humble judgment, as disclosed by this record, beginning on page 124 of the printed hearings, has failed for a long time to make a proper appraisal of the rate structure under which both the domestic air-mail carriers and the foreign carriers of air mail receive their compensation. It should be directed to the attention of the Civil Aeronautics Authority that they should act in response to the charges that both the foreign air-mail carriers and the domestic air-mail carriers in many instances are fattening themselves unduly at the expense of the taxpayers who are paying the charges for carrying this mail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HAINES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. May I inquire of the gentleman if he agrees with me that Mr. Purdum has proven himself to be an efficient public servant in connection with his work with that Department?

Mr. KEEFE. My experience as a member of this committee and my contacts with Mr. Smith Purdum, convince

me definitely that he is an efficient, loyal servant of the public, an indefatigable worker, and one in whom I have the highest confidence.

Mr. HAINES. I am very pleased to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. KEEFE. And what I say on behalf of Mr. Purdum may likewise be said of the other Assistant Postmasters General. I think they are all splendid examples of outstanding Americans who are devoting themselves assiduously to the public service.

Mr. HAINES. The gentleman realizes, of course, that I am a member of the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee, and I have occasion to come in contact with these men very frequently. I am glad to have the gentleman pay that tribute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the observation just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which is concurred in by the gentleman from Wisconsin now occupying the floor. I simply want to add my own personal appreciation for the services in a governmental agency such as is being given to America and its people by Smith Purdum. He came up from the ranks, and the position he now holds in the Post Office Department is the result of long labor and efficient service and a degree of sincerity equaled by few men.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman. May I say further to the distinguished gentleman that for the first time in my experience at least and for many prior years I am advised, the Postmaster General himself appeared before the committee in support of the justifications for the Post Office Department. May I say that I believe the office of Postmaster General is in very safe and efficient hands in the person of Mr. Frank Walker. He demonstrated before our committee that he has a very unusual grasp of the affairs of the Post Office Department, and I believe that that Department will be most splendidly administered under his direction and leadership as Postmaster General.

Mr. HAINES. I am very pleased to have the gentleman make that statement, because I concur in what he has just stated. I was interested in the gentleman's analysis of the air-mail situation. Can the gentleman tell the Members of the House what the deficit really is in the carrying of air mail?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not think we should look upon the charge or an appropriation that is made for carrying the air mail as a deficit. It is simply a payment made to the air-mail companies pursuant to rates that are fixed by the Civil Aeronautics Authority for the carrying of that mail.

Mr. HAINES. Does the record show what the income for carrying the air mail amounted to in 1940?

Mr. KEEFE. I am frank to say I have not those figures before me at the present time.

Mr. HAINES. It is my understanding that the air mail is practically paying its own way.

Mr. TABER. I think I can explain that and I did when I had the floor. You cannot tell anything about it. They have a set of figures whereby they compute the amount of air-mail postage sold and against that they put the payments to the contractors. They do not take into consideration the incidental cost of handling the mail, they do not take into consideration nor do they have a record of the mail that goes air mail under other kinds of postage. You cannot tell anything about it.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. As I observed the hearings, it is very difficult to answer a question of that kind due to the complicated method of keeping the books and records.

Mr. HAINES. May I compliment the gentleman on his fine statement and express my thanks for his courtesy?

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am mighty happy to hear the complimentary remarks made by the gentleman concerning our Postmaster General, Mr. Frank Walker. I have had the privilege and honor of knowing Frank Walker since he was a young man, as he spent his early manhood in Montana as a lawyer. He is not only a splendid and great citizen, but he is a mighty good lawyer. He went to New York and became a national figure in politics. We, like the gentleman from Wisconsin, are very proud of Mr. Walker. We are also very happy to know that the gentleman from Wisconsin has shown himself big enough to pay a fine compliment to a worthy Democrat and office holder.

I also wish to compliment the gentleman on the very fine things he has said about Mr. Purdum. I have had a great deal of business with Mr. Purdum and have found him to be one of the most capable, honest, and sincere public servants it has ever been my privilege to know.

Mr. KEEFE. I have found in my contacts with these gentlemen in the Department that they are operating a business. The men in the Assistant Postmaster Generals' offices are businessmen and career men. They are managing this agency of the Government. The question of politics, as far as I am advised, does not involve the decisions of these men in directing the affairs of this great business organization. They are entitled to be congratulated upon the efforts they are putting forth to expedite the carrying of the mails and to render to the American people the service the people are paying for.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Reimbursement to carriers of deficits during Federal control: For the payment of claims certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the provisions of section 204 of the Transportation Act of 1920, as amended by the act of January 7, 1941, covering reimbursement to carriers of deficits incurred during the period of control of railroads by the Government, not to exceed \$600,000 of the unexpended balance of funds made available to the Treasury Department for these

purposes for the fiscal year 1942 in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1943.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to call your attention to several items dealing with nondefense expenditures. I have listened attentively to Members of this Committee on both sides of the aisle discuss this Post Office-Treasury appropriation bill. I am satisfied there is no way of cutting down the expenditures in these two important Departments. If we are to cut nondefense expenditures, I am convinced that they cannot be cut in either of these Departments.

However, there is an important job for the House to do. There are many places where cutting of nondefense spending must be done. We must have the courage to act on the advice of Raymond Clapper.

He had this to say in the New York World-Telegram on December 12:

I found in England that after 2 years of war there was still free criticism of the Government. It was regarded as healthy and stimulating and one of the prerogatives of a free country.

American solidarity behind the war does not mean blind, unquestioning resignation to everything that is done. Our unanimity means that we are all participating in the effort. We are sharing the decision, not merely accepting it.

Last night we heard on the radio a speech of Democratic national chairman, Mr. Edward Flynn, in which he made certain unfair charges and accusations. In contrast to Mr. Flynn's statement, I read an editorial appearing last Sunday in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, a Democratic newspaper. We had the privilege of having as our guest in Cleveland last Friday evening Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, chairman of the Republican National Committee and minority floor leader. This Democratic newspaper, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, commented as follows on Mr. MARTIN's speech:

The Republican Party's war program as outlined by the party chairman, Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., in his Cleveland address is one that will be endorsed by every American who believes that the continuation of our way of life is worth fighting for both on the foreign battlefield and in the home sector.

The Republican Party, says Chairman MARTIN, must support the administration wholeheartedly in every measure designed to prevent a totalitarian victory in the war. But it must also fight to arrest any march toward state socialism in America after the war.

The editorial of the Cleveland Plain Dealer continues:

It is unfortunate that the two fights must go on simultaneously.

This editorial is headlined:

Two wars in one.

The editorial continues:

The task of beating the Axis is enormous enough to occupy all our energies and thoughts, and the realization of ultimate victory is almost certain to be delayed by a second conflict at home between those who believe in individualism and those who would subject us to collectivism. Yet, so long as the party in power at Washington tolerates the presence of the collectivists in the Government service, not a few of them in high office, and so long as the President himself does nothing to discourage them from taking advantage of the war to promote their un-American theories, the second conflict is unavoidable even while the war progresses. For, as Congressman MARTIN asks, "What would it avail to win this war and then lose our Government of, by, and for the people?"

This march toward state socialism would be easy to stop were its organizers operating in the open. The collectivists know this too well. They have learned by experience that outright attacks on the American way of life are no go; that the great majority of citizens will not stand for them.

It should be made clear, as Chairman MARTIN makes it, that the fight against state socialism does not in any way involve the necessary war powers of the Government. Military victory cannot be won by debate, as we have learned in every other war. The executive branch must have the ability to act. American democracy has never yet failed to recover the liberties it has given up temporarily in time of war.

The danger lies, rather, in the effort to use the war as an excuse to promote social revolution.

I point to a measure that is coming before us, the "pork barrel" rivers and harbors bill. This morning the Rivers and Harbors Committee met and inserted a provision sugar-coating this pork-barrel program in a manner such as the Cleveland Plain Dealer describes:

If anyone is unaware of how this march toward state socialism is being promoted, let him begin his education on the subject by reading the series of articles in the New Yorker magazine by Alva Johnston concerning the 3-year court battle in which Thurman Arnold attempted to convict the Aluminum Co. of America on 140 counts for alleged violation of the antitrust laws. Johnston shows that while the Government failed to make a single one of these counts stick in court, Arnold got what he wanted through misleading press releases which created the general impression—an impression since promoted by new dealers in and out of office—that Alcoa was guilty of every charge made against it.

Recalling that the fall of France brought some criticism in Congress of continued New Deal persecution of business and a threat of decreased appropriations for those Government bureaus engaged in this persecution, Johnston continues: "This threat caused some quick thinking. The same threat hung over certain other Government agencies which were considered luxuries of peace times. They all met it the same way; they found they were essential to national defense. Every bureau in Washington did itself over in war paint. When the blast of war blows in the ears of a bureaucrat, he imitates the action of the tiger; he stiffens the sinews, summons up the blood, and fights like mad for more appropriations."

"Arnold discovered that the way to whip Hitler was to attack more American industries. He asked Congress for extra money so that he could sue and sue and sue until Hitler cried uncle."

President Roosevelt is quoted as saying that there are too many unneeded persons in

Washington, and he urges everyone in the Capital to ask himself, "Are you a parasite?" The President's point is well taken. But he himself could help alleviate the crowded condition in Washington by abolishing many of the bureaus and agencies which are not needed to win the war, especially those who continue to promote the war against the American way of life.

They are the true parasites in Washington. So long as they remain, the Nation cannot be united as it should be for the greater effort. So long as they remain, we are in danger of losing the very thing we are fighting for in Asia and Europe and off the coasts of America.

I might comment here that it is important for Members of the House to watch this process in Washington where some of these nondefense bureaus are doing themselves over in war paint and labeling themselves as defense agencies when, in reality, they have no relation to defense, similar to many of the projects contained in the rivers and harbors bill that will be up here for consideration within 2 weeks' time. These projects will be labeled as defense projects, and they have absolutely no relation to defense.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering if the gentleman would consider the appointment of Melvyn Douglas to the O. C. D. to teach civilians to dance a part of the defense program.

Mr. BENDER. The question of the distinguished gentleman requires no answer. You can use your own judgment.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of saying briefly what I think about certain things that are being done. I think neither the time nor the occasion nor even the situation in which we find ourselves justify a violation of the fundamental law of this land by the Treasury Department of the country. There is no authority in law to be found, so far as I know, which justifies the appointment of 48 State administrators for the sale of defense stamps and bonds at salaries ranging from \$4,600 to \$8,000 per, to say nothing about the organizations necessary to be set up to make the work of these State directors effective. The sad part of it is that the Treasury Department has been compelled, as it has thought, or else there can be no scintilla of justification, to adopt this method and this program by reason of the complacency and the indifference of the American people in this, their time of greatest peril. The American people should hide their heads if the action of the Treasury Department was and is made necessary because of their dereliction of patriotism. I am not so much here this minute to criticize the violation of the law—and it should be criticized—as I am to find fault with the American people who will not wake up to what confronts them.

I do not like this way of doing business. Freedom is not to be measured in dollars. The liberties the people love are lost unless they realize the price they will have to pay. The cost should not be amplified

and magnified by setting up a host of paid solicitors to raise funds to save the people at their expense.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, in discussing this huge appropriation of \$8,000,000,000 for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, a number of Members have agreed there should and must be curtailments made in nondefense expenditures. Then it is said it seems to be too difficult to do much about it insofar, at least, as expenditures in the departments are concerned.

I think something can be done about it, if this Congress has the courage to do it. We can reduce these expenses and we can reduce employment in a number of these bureaus and departments, so these employees may be transferred to positions where they are needed in carrying on our war effort.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest the Appropriations Committee, composed of 40 of the leading Members of this House, appoint a subcommittee of its group, to investigate and examine every department of government, not directly connected with those engaged in the war effort, with a view of eliminating, coordinating, and consolidating wherever it is possible to do so. The bureaus and departments will not make an effort to do it. They have not done it in the past to my knowledge.

I feel very sure that if the situation were gone into carefully, at least 10 to 15 percent of our 200,000 employees could be transferred from nonessential jobs to places where their services are needed. We could save the employment of twenty or twenty-five thousand new people who are likewise needed in other places. We could do away with a lot of services that we do not really need right now. For example, every department has its publicity bureau or agency. Part of it is all right and needed. A great deal of it is unnecessary. You could save that labor and save the material. One of our Members estimated a few days ago that about 90,000 tons of paper would be used in Washington in the next year. You know that a great deal of the material, not all of it of course, is never used. I think you could cut out a third of it and hardly miss it. The material and labor on this item costs millions of dollars annually. Some of the printing is pretty extravagantly done. Surely a good part of it is not necessary right now.

Mr. Chairman, after all this committee and this Congress should have hold of the purse strings. The people of this country are being asked to save and to economize. Why not apply a little more of that principle in the management of our Government, and get in line so we can provide more support, more material, more money, and more effort in the prosecution of the war where it is so much needed?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly.

Mr. KEEFE. I take it the gentleman is familiar with the fact that such a committee is at work right now and is holding hearings every day. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] appeared before this committee this morning, and the opportunity is open to any Member of Congress, including the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, to come before that committee and offer suggestions for the reduction of nonessential and nondefense expenditures. The gentleman is a member of the Civil Service Committee, which reported in the civil-service bill. Does the gentleman realize that in this bill there are millions of dollars of additional appropriations required to pay the automatic promotions that are provided for by the bill that passed the Congress, which was brought before the Congress from the gentleman's committee, and that the Committee on Appropriations has no control over the question at all and must make the appropriations in conformity to the substantive law passed by the Congress? The gentleman must realize, I am sure, when he is inferentially critical of the work of the Committee on Appropriations, that that is a matter that must be handled in the gentleman's committee. I suggest to the gentleman if he wants to accomplish reduction in appropriations that he introduce legislation to change the substantive laws that direct and determine the amount of appropriations. The Committee on Appropriations is not organized for that purpose and would be severely criticized by the Members of the House if it attempted to usurp the prerogatives of the legislative committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin, but let me say first, that I shall be glad to appear before the committee he has in mind. I assume he refers to what is known as the Byrd committee. That committee has been doing a lot of commendable and constructive work. Also, let me say that I did not support all of the provisions in the bill to which the gentleman refers, and that I am one of the few members of that committee who opposed increases in payments to the high-salaried groups. I am also one of the members of that committee who opposed the bill which, among other things, provides for the retirement of Members of this Congress, and who opposed the same kind of legislation when it was considered by this House 2 years ago. If the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin will lend his support and have the courage to go along with me and help to strike from the legislation passed the other day the provision which gives to Members of Congress the opportunity of retiring under the retirement bill, I shall

appreciate his support, as well as the support of other Members of this body. I agree with the gentleman that we have on many occasions through various committees submitted reports and passed legislation, and that the Committee on Appropriations has felt it should approve in carrying out such legislation, and I do say to him that we have thousands of men and women who are now in the Government service who are performing some service, perhaps worth while, but in my judgment unnecessary in these crucial times.

The thing that I am asking the committee and the Congress to do is to make a careful and systematic study of every department of government, not definitely related to our war effort, and reduce the expenses and the personnel to the very limit. All employees that are qualified can be transferred to the departments where their services are needed. It will save the necessity of employing thousands of new additional employees and will work for a little economy in government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to be a member of the Byrd committee, which is trying to find nonessential governmental expenditures which might be eliminated. It does not make any difference whether they are labeled "defense expenditures" or not. If they are not essential, we are trying to find them out and point them out.

We are holding hearings practically all the time. I have run onto quite a lot of things in connection with that and other things. I think some of the worst nonessential rackets that we have bear the fraudulent label of "defense." A little while ago I found out that the engineering and overhead expense for putting up a defense housing unit which cost \$4,200 was \$613, or 14 percent, when a private builder would not think of paying more than 6 percent to an architect, and if he were building mass units of the same kind he would not pay more than 4 percent.

Now, do you tell me we cannot save money on that kind of a set-up?

Then, in connection with the defense outfits, in connection with the Government real-estate operations, you can go into the same community and you can find administering and looking after Government real estate the H. O. L. C. with a separate set-up; the Farm Security Administration with a separate set-up; the United States Housing Authority with a separate set-up; the Federal Works Administration with a separate set-up. I presume quite a lot of other outfits. You cannot tell me that all those things should not be consolidated and that we should not get rid of the unnecessary real-estate agents who are on the Government pay roll.

I think we ought to begin to realize that there must be some coordination of these Government activities so that we can get rid of some of that useless spending of Government money.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In connection with some of these expenditures, on Sunday afternoon I took the time to go out and walk through some of these little homes being built up near the naval testing basin on Conduit Road, where they are putting up scores of these defense-housing units. I find that on those temporary buildings they are using copper pipe for all the plumbing. As scarce as copper is, with our going into South America and doing what we are there to get copper, we still put copper pipe in a little temporary defense-housing unit around Washington, when galvanized pipe would last for 15 years and serve the same purpose.

Mr. TABER. Then the O. C. D. this morning hired a moving-picture star to teach dancing to the civilian population. That is a great accomplishment for defense, is it not? Do you not think that is an item that could be dispensed with and gotten rid of? We must begin to show some interest in protecting the Treasury of the United States. If my boy or your boy is called, he goes into the trenches. What is the matter with these dancers going into the trenches?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, while we are talking about savings and some of the unnecessary expenses of government, let me recall some of the economics of an earlier day. I live in the country, when I am at home and am proud of the fact that I have always followed what I was taught as a little boy, to save part of what I earned, to put my pennies in the bank. I was taught that if I had a penny I did not know what to do with I should not waste it but should put it in the little bank on the mantelpiece. When you save 100 pennies you have a dollar. This philosophy should have a forceful appeal to Members of Congress, even though today it seems threadbare, outworn, and is so frequently cast to the winds. But we have got to get back to the old days when we counted every penny. We must cut out waste—the greatest item of thrift for our Government today.

I hold in my hand a beautiful pamphlet about 9 by 12 inches in size, luxuriously designed, a work of art, about 70 or 80 pages in length. It is labeled "A Challenge," and is produced and distributed by the Office of Production Management. It is one of the most picturesque and expensive pieces of printing I have seen in a long, long time. It came to my office about 3 weeks ago.

I quote a sentence from it:

Every top executive of a defense plant faces this challenge: Get out production on time with the smallest possible waste and no sacrifice of quality.

Every plant executive certainly knows that and is so doing. Look through this pamphlet, read it, and you will see it is full of material we were taught in primary school years and years ago. It is just a primer, but it is made up for the working executives of the United States. It is beautiful, of fine paper, printed in large type, and only on one side of the paper.

If ever there has been a waste of the American taxpayers' money I think this is it. I feel that those responsible for this booklet ought to be taken off the Government pay roll.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Does the gentleman realize that the officers and executives in O. P. M. are selected from amongst the best executives of the Nation, selected because of their accomplishment and ability? Is the gentleman going to question the judgment of the top flight business executives of the United States?

Mr. RICH. I will say in fairness to Mr. Donald M. Nelson that this publication was put out before he was placed in charge of war production; but if this is an example of the productive ability and capacity of the top flight men in O. P. M., then God save America, from the O. P. M. if we have to depend on them to win this war, for they will never do it in such waste and extravagance as this example of printing.

I challenge any Member of Congress, I care not who he is, to show that this is a wise use of Government funds, that it is an essential expenditure. If it is so held I believe that eventually the people of the country will rue the fact we have men of this character trying to conduct the affairs of Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

This is my favorite topic, "expenditures of the Government." I am glad to see the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] here. I have not bothered him lately, but now I am about to demand that the majority side of this House investigate themselves a little. On war measures, let us vote without talking; the minority will be with you. But I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], who really still acts as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures, that I congratulate him in that he has quietly done some good work—very quietly. He takes matters up with the Comptroller General. But on the floor of the House he must not let his own party feel that he is meddling or trying to investigate any odorous matters. I want to say to him, however, that when the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] makes a speech such as he made here the other day, that the Committee on Expenditures better get busy. I have asked for 30 minutes day after tomorrow, as I have a recital to make about the unemployment racket which is getting such headway and which needs to be uncovered and checked. These are not war measures, and there lies a duty on this side of the House to watch appropriations, and because the majority will not investigate their own expenditures.

Mention has been made of Melvyn Douglas and men of similar qualifications regarding their appointments to places in Washington. They are appointed because someone in high authority or sitting in high places whispers, "We want you to appoint this one or that one." We know where the suggestions come from. Those who have the

power of appointment must listen to suggestions from such sources.

In closing, I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], perhaps we are tied down with laws that have been passed and failed to repeal. The Appropriations Committee must necessarily keep on appropriating. How about the tremendous number of Executive orders setting up agencies which are carried on by blanket appropriations given to the President? Why make them permanent? Let us be watchful as to making them permanent institutions.

You have final control of the purse strings relating to agencies set up by these Executive orders. Why do we not immediately repeal that Silver Act? Why have you an appropriation in this bill to buy silver when the Treasurer of the United States himself wants you to repeal the act? Do you still feel that you have to appropriate money for this purpose? Perhaps you are obliged to appropriate a little. There is little justification for any great appropriation to buy more silver. It is acknowledged to be a foolish proceeding. Often have I spoken in condemnation of that Silver Act. Of course, new Members do not know that. Some of us older ones have complained much about many such foolish things in the past. But every time we criticize anything or anybody, someone on the majority side of the House must necessarily rise and defend. Only the President can force action from this majority. When we demand an investigation of anything, a letter is sent to the department involved, and the reply comes back, "Everything is all right." Then you get up the next day and move that our request be laid on the table. The futility of it all! But let us continue our protests. It is our clear duty.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Massachusetts seems to be unable to realize I am no longer chairman of that committee, but I admit I do take an active interest in it. I have repeatedly told the gentleman from Massachusetts that if he will lay before the committee any evidence which warrants an investigation, I will vote for the investigation. I have told other Members of the House the same thing. A Member on the Democratic side came to me the other day and showed me a resolution and wanted to know if I would support it. It provided for a select committee to investigate a Government agency. I told him, "No; that is a duty of the Committee on Expenditures." I told him further if he would come before the committee and place facts before that committee which warranted an investigation and not a fishing trip, I would vote for the investigation. He never came before the committee. He never wrote the chairman. But he did go to his own committee, the Committee on Agriculture, and caused a subcommittee to be appointed to make the investigation.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does the gentleman think there is reason enough for an investigation after the speech of Mr. Winter that was made the other day?

Mr. COCHRAN. I did not read the speech the gentleman refers to, but I will.

Mr. GIFFORD. I may have to take back my compliment that the gentleman is watchful. I am amazed that a speech like that could possibly have escaped the gentleman's or anybody else's attention on that side of the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. We only have 24 hours in a day, and it is impossible to read everything that goes in the Record and still get sleep which is more necessary. I know I cannot do it, especially everything put in the Appendix of the Record. My good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] got tired of rising here and calling attention to filling up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with matter that does not belong in it. They do not get anywhere. Even though he is a member of the Committee on Printing he never brought out a resolution prohibiting us from putting newspaper articles, and so forth, in the Record.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If I can get a little bit of help from that side, I will still try it, but until I can get some help there is no possible chance to cut down the Record.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will give the gentleman a little bit. I will vote with him.

Mr. RICH. Let us—you and I—then, stand up here every day and stop a lot of it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have been stopping enough legislation here. I have too many Members on my back now. Let some of the other Members get up and follow my example of stopping some of these bills. I helped stop a \$40,000,000 bill the other day and it was defeated.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is very watchful over the Indians, but may I say it was well advertised that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] was to speak, and it was on the calendar for several days. He spoke from the Well of this House and it caused a good deal of foment. It was in regard to a very important matter. I cannot imagine how it escaped the gentleman. He is acting chairman of this committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not acting chairman at all.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, yes; you do all the acting.

Mr. COCHRAN. What kind of an actor am I?

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is very effective with little things, but how he does protect his party on the big things. He is one of the most able men we have, and one of the most loyal men in his party. He is a safe chairman for that committee, or, rather, acting chairman.

Mr. COCHRAN. If I were like the gentleman from Massachusetts, especially able to play the piano and sing, I think I would be out in Hollywood instead of here.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does the gentleman mean to convey the thought that playing the piano is something that should be deprecated? Is it something against me?

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, certainly not; I commend the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. At least I could keep in tune and I could attempt to strike the right keys to tune in with the gentleman when he gets ready to act.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts and I have been on that committee ever since it was organized. I was chairman of the committee during the last 2 years of the Hoover administration. Despite the demand made upon me by my side of the House when we were in control, I adopted the policy then that before I would be willing to have an investigation somebody would have to lay something on the table. With one exception, during those 2 years, when Mr. Hoover was still in the White House, there never was an investigation of his activities by that committee, because nobody brought facts before the committee that justified an investigation.

Mr. GIFFORD. Did not the gentleman say, "when they laid this thing on the table"? He is the man who lays everything on the table.

Mr. COCHRAN. Only once in a while, when I think I have something in hand to back it up.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Recoinage of silver coins: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to continue the recoinage of worn and uncurrent subsidiary silver coins of the United States now in the Treasury or hereafter received, and to reimburse the Treasurer of the United States for the difference between the nominal or face value of such coins and the amount the same will produce in new coins, \$350,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Members to a statement of Mr. Graves, of the Treasury Department, appearing on page 279 of the hearings:

Mr. LUDLOW. If I understood Mr. Morgenthau correctly the other night, I think he said that the proceeds from these bonds now topped half a billion dollars per month.

Mr. GRAVES. It was about \$528,000,000 for December.

Mr. LUDLOW. That was the peak so far?

Mr. GRAVES. Yes, sir; that was the peak so far.

Mr. RICH. If you take the statement of January 1, you will be in the red about \$7,500,000,000—

I assume the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] meant the deficit from July 1 down to that date.

Mr. RICH. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] continued:

How will you finance the Government from now until June 30?

Mr. GRAVES. In the open market.

Mr. RICH. Through banks?

Mr. GRAVES. To the extent necessary to supplement revenues and the borrowings through Defense Savings bonds, we will go to the banks for it.

Mr. Chairman, I think the record will show that about January 29, 1941, when the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means requesting an increase in the debt limit on interest-bearing debts from approximately \$49,000,000,000 to \$65,000,-

000,000, the Treasury at that time asked for permission to issue certain types of defense bonds to the end that it would be unnecessary to go to the commercial banks for the purpose of finding a home for the new issues that were to be put out by the Treasury. I think you will find his testimony that day was to the effect that we should not place in the commercial banks any additional Defense bonds. I believe the record will also show that from time to time since that date the Secretary of the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System have repeatedly pointed out the dangers of our further placing in the portfolios of the commercial banks the new securities we must issue from time to time in order to finance the war operations.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury and his entire personnel, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, are falling down in their duties in not pointing out to the people of this country the tremendous inflationary forces we are developing in this country through our failure to buy more of these Defense bonds and to pay more taxes, thereby making it unnecessary for the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the new issues to the commercial banks. It seems to me that during the next 18 to 24 months the Treasury will have to issue approximately \$90,000,000,000 of new securities in order to finance the war program, based upon the present concept of war operations.

As the indicator now points, we may have to place between \$30,000,000,000 and \$45,000,000,000 of these new issues, or, roughly, 50 percent, in the portfolios of the commercial banks, expanding demand deposits accordingly, thereby adding fuel to the fires of inflation which inflation the Price-Control Act is supposed to prevent.

I am surprised to see this direct admission on the part of Mr. Graves of the Treasury Department now boldly made to the effect that the Treasury intends to sell to the commercial banks, or, let us say, to the 12 Federal Reserve banks, and the members of the Federal Reserve Banking System which are primarily commercial banks, whatever is necessary to sell over and above what is contributed in the form of taxes and, what I believe to be the measly amount of defense bonds purchased, since the \$528,000,000 sold in December seems to be the peak we have reached in any one month. Considering the obligations we have assumed and the dangers we have invited, this monthly quantity purchased is to me, a contemptible small performance.

With the most staggering financing program ever faced by any Federal Treasury unusual developments will occur in the near future. This is February 3. The Congress is authorizing appropriations in single bills running as high as \$25,000,000,000. The Government will spend in the immediate months \$90,000,000,000 to \$100,000,000,000 to apply on cost of war. Wage and salary pay rolls are running about \$12,000,000,000 higher than a year ago. No definite tax proposal has yet been presented to Congress. A vast army of

high-priced market men is being brought together for purpose of inducing people to purchase defense bonds—but, public is not responding to this call in proportion to the need. The Treasury has, from time to time, spoken relative to a withholding tax applied in such a way as to absorb more or less of the earnings of industrial workers benefiting through wage and salary increases as a result of Government spending. But, this is an election year and such a tax approach is not palatable to the politicians. Accordingly, there is great hesitancy on the tax approach. At the same time the public occupies a difficult position in attempting to allocate a certain percentage of individual annual incomes to the purchase of defense bonds before knowing what the individual Federal tax liability is likely to be. We hear rumors of a withholding tax, a pay-roll tax, higher excess-profits taxes, less normal taxes, higher surtaxes, and a sales tax; and, about enforced savings to be invested in war bonds, together with taxes in the form of deferred wages to be paid in the post-war period, and a deferred rehabilitation reserve fund to be used in the post-war period and built up through forcing corporations to make the necessary contributions at the present time. Mr. Roosevelt's plans for the expenditure of one-half the annual income per annum on the war effort will, it is reasonable to assume, strain the Nation's industrial capacity to the utmost. Even if taxes are increased sharply the expenditures as now planned will rise more rapidly. We can safely assume that the maximum tax burden applied will provide no more than one-half of the total of Government outlay. So, it appears the Government must soon borrow from someone no less than \$2,000,000,000 monthly.

Excess reserves are declining; heavy withdrawals from the banks of currency continue; and this will contribute to further decline in the excess reserves. The direct interest-bearing debt of the Government is to be doubled. Beginning July 1, 1942, it appears the Treasury will have to dispose of approximately \$3,000,000,000 of securities monthly. Now, if the social-security contributions accommodate, let us say, three and one-half billion dollars per annum; and, let us say, sales of defense bonds reach \$12,000,000,000—who is to buy the remaining \$20,500,000,000? Apparently these will have to be sold to insurance companies and other corporate investors, including commercial banks and perhaps the Federal Reserve banks. Altogether we face a considerable problem. Under such circumstances, what real value can be attached to observations made by the Secretary of the Treasury with reference to the likelihood of no action being taken to tax now partially tax-exempt Government securities? The war will have to be financed, and bankers and others so directly interested should, as far as possible, comprehend the entire problem and draw their own conclusions as to what steps will be taken to meet the emergency when it arises.

If you will permit me to express a personal view, it is to this effect: This is an election year. Congress will be reluctant

to proceed too aggressively against the voters, and so will the entire administration. There is less political liability in taxing corporations as against individuals. There is less political liability in taxing State and municipal issues as against industrial pay rollees. There is less opposition to having the Federal Reserve System purchase obligations direct from the Treasury than in forcing citizens to purchase defense bonds. Finally, who, in terms of numbers, will oppose the taxing of presently partially tax-exempt Government bonds when the individuals must necessarily be burdened with brutal taxes? I say, Mr. Chairman, we can better afford to purchase a much greater amount of defense bonds and pay far greater taxes than to cram additional billions of dollars' worth of war bonds into the portfolios of the commercial banks and take the consequences hereafter.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I do this, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of getting some information with reference to a matter concerning which I have spoken several times on this floor in years gone by.

In every appropriation bill that comes to us and in many other bills we see provision for rather large sums for printing and binding. Judging by even the limited amount of the output of printing and binding that comes across the desk of a Member of Congress, it seems to me there is an opportunity for quite a bit of reduction in our nondefense spending by looking more carefully into unnecessary printing and binding, also in avoiding duplication in what is made available through the printing press.

May I inquire, if the figures are available, how much the Government is spending on an annual basis in the various departments and agencies for printing and binding? I do not know whether any member of the Committee on Appropriations can give this information, but I think it is something we might well look into. I believe a great deal of this printing and binding can very easily be eliminated without any detriment to the service or to the promotion of our national defense.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Every appropriation bill that comes before the House has in it an item for printing and binding. Every department of the Government is after all the money it can get for that particular purpose. There is a continuous fight in the Appropriations Committee to keep these amounts down. I do not know how you are going to keep them down unless you change a lot of laws and compel the Secretary to limit to the very minimum the amount you are going to grant them each year for printing and binding.

Mr. LANHAM. Attention has been called on this floor many times, by various Members, to useless publications that involve expense to the taxpayers of this Nation, and I think the Appropriations Committee, if they are not able to give us the figures now, should make a com-

putation of the annual sum we are putting into printing and binding and see if we cannot do a little nondefense saving along that line. The mere fact that the figures are not available as to how much we are spending annually in this respect indicates it is worthy of inquiry.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I cannot tell the gentleman how much is being spent for this purpose, but I did notice in the paper that the largest item of freight out of the city of Washington was wastepaper.

Mr. LANHAM. I fancy the sum we expend annually is rather a staggering one.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman will find that the direct appropriations for this particular purpose would run easily to \$50,000,000, but the indirect appropriations would be way beyond that amount, being items which you could not cover. You will find a very large percentage of this propaganda that goes out is mimeographed or printed on Government-operated presses in the Departments, with some kind of multigraph machine or something of that sort, and it is absolutely impossible to trace the cost of those operations or the employees who operate them.

Mr. LANHAM. It seems to me the expenditure of a very small sum of money in an investigation of this matter, if the expenditures in the aggregate are so large, would certainly result in quite a saving in eliminating duplication and avoiding unnecessary printing and binding.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not only should we save the money and reduce expenditures, but paper has become a strategic material, and we are going to have an enormous paper shortage in this country. This material is just being wasted by the carloads.

Mr. LANHAM. And, furthermore, we might find that some are employed in such printing who are not necessary and their removal would reduce the housing shortage in the District.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

I think there is a great deal of merit in what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has had to say regarding Government waste in printing and binding, but I think it should be pointed out that if we should completely eliminate Government expenditures for printing and binding we would not be able to make appreciable cuts in the appropriations which are made. It is my impression that the total amount of Government money spent annually for printing and binding in all the Government agencies does not exceed \$15,000,000. So, after all, while it is a vitally important factor,

it is not one of the major expenditures of the Government.

Now, in regard to this particular bill which carries an appropriation for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, we must remember that millions of additional forms are being required at this time on account of the change in our revenue laws, and it might be well to point out that in the Bureau of Printing and Engraving, which is carried in this bill, innumerable bonds and other Government securities are being printed at this time, all of which are required. The committee has done what it could to seek to eliminate useless printing and binding, and I am compelled to say that a lot of it is useless, and I would like to join with the gentleman in doing everything possible along the line suggested by the gentleman.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank my colleague. I may say that I was not directing my criticism to any particular item in this bill. I know there are agencies of the Government that necessarily require a great deal of printing, but there are a great many publications that come across our desks that are absolutely useless and futile, and we do not see half of them, I am sure.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, I am sure that is correct, but I doubt if printing and binding is more important to any agency than the Post Office and the Treasury Department, and probably there would be a greater likelihood of cutting that figure in other departments. I think we ought to make every effort to cut wherever we can. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has previously pointed out the wasteful practices of the Government in printing and binding and he is to be commended for again raising this important subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a week or two ago I had occasion to make some observations on the expenditure for printing and binding. The matter came to my attention because I had been observing in the newspapers that the school children of Washington and other localities in the country and the Boy Scouts have been collecting waste paper to supplement a school fund out of which they might stage an entertainment, or buy a flag, or add a few books to their library. From their frugality and diligence we might well take a lesson. It was stimulating enough, at least, for me to assemble some figures, and I discovered, after getting some figures—and I direct this particularly to my friend from Texas—that the use of paper for the calendar year 1941 will probably exceed 203,000,000 pounds. This includes the overrun, it includes the purchases of the Government Printing Office, and the cut sheets that are used for multigraphing and mimeographing, and other purposes, in the executive agencies of the Government. That means that there will flow between the departments and out of Washington 100,000 tons of paper in the course of a single fiscal year. When you talk about paper being a critical material, indeed we may, as charity, begin at home, and clean our own skirts a little bit in the matter of wasting paper. Obviously there are forms, statements, reports that

are absolutely necessary in the functioning of agencies of government, but I doubt very much whether all these ornamental, highly colored publications and reports and specialties and novelties on gloss paper and otherwise are entirely justified.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. I wonder if the gentleman has any information as to the proportion of this paper going out of Washington, on Government business of one kind and another, and how that amount compares with other cities in sending out vast volumes of printed material, like catalogs, newspapers, and so forth.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no comparative figures, but the 203,000,000 pounds I refer to are the purchases of Government paper, and that means over 100,000 tons. Surely somewhere along the line we ought to be able to economize. Two or 3 years ago I discovered a little item in the report of the Government Printer, that the last copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3 years ago, after the session had come to a conclusion, required 38 tons of paper. Surely in our extensions of remarks we might be a little more circumspect, and see that everything is not put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and in similar fashion, the agencies of Government that are promiscuously sending out circulars, brochures, pamphlets, dodgers, and everything else could suppress some of that information and space it so that there would be a generous saving of paper.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman, as other Members of Congress, has recently been furnished 400 copies of the agricultural yearbook, weighing approximately 5 pounds per book, meaning that each Member of Congress gets a ton of paper, to say nothing of the printing and the high-grade paper at that, to distribute promiscuously about the respective districts. Does the gentleman not think that in the interest of economy, with this Nation now at war, we could dispense with the future publication of that big book, at least for the duration?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly there are some things with which we could dispense for the time being. I went to the trouble in the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill to total the discoverable printing and paper items, and as I remember it now, it was in excess of \$1,100,000, and for the Department of Agriculture it will run well over \$1,000,000 in a single year. That may give some basis for an estimate of what the expenditure is in the purchase of paper, and that does not include the employees and specialists who decorate that paper with the English language to make it palatable.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Following up the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Illinois, I doubt that any Member of this House

can or should read more than 10 percent of the Government publications that come across his desk.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I think it develops a bad reading habit. We become what in literary parlance is known as skimmers. How can you do otherwise, unless you chuck everything into the wastebasket? Otherwise you must skim the headlines so that you may not miss something that is worth while before throwing it into the wastebasket.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the amount of paper purchased amounted to 203,000,000 pounds?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Two hundred and three million pounds is the estimate for the current year.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I think the gentleman's arithmetical computation is wrong if he thinks that will amount to 100,000 tons.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The computation is correct. It is more than 100,000 tons. At least 203,000,000 pounds of paper, and that figure I got from Mr. Wold, who is an authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

CREATED MONEY TO PAY COST OF WAR

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] brought to our attention a very interesting question, that is, the extent that the Government expects to go in this emergency in having the private commercial banks create money for the purpose of paying the cost of the war.

BANKS CREATE MONEY

No informed person can dispute the fact that commercial banks, that accept deposits, when they buy Government bonds, create out of thin air the money with which to buy those bonds. No informed person will dispute that fact. Everyone who has ever studied the question admits it and acknowledges it.

IF MONEY TO BE CREATED, GOVERNMENT SHOULD CREATE IT WITHOUT INTEREST

So the point is, if money is to be created for the purpose of paying the cost of this war, should the people and the taxpayers and the Government pay private commercial banks to create the Government's own money, when that privilege is exclusively the Government's under the Constitution of the United States, and the duty rests upon the Congress to see that it is complied with?

BILL PROPOSED TO STOP SOME INTEREST PAYMENTS

May I humbly invite your attention to a discussion of that subject which is in the RECORD of February 2, 1942, which came out this morning, on page A324. It contains a discussion of a bill which I introduced some time ago providing for the Federal Reserve banks to advance the money on Government non-interest-bearing bonds for the purpose of paying the cost of this war. Every person who has given this question thought, I believe, will say that this national debt, at the end of the emergency, if it con-

tinues as long as we expect it to continue, will certainly be around \$150,000,000,000, including our present debt, if not more than that. If we pay 4 percent interest on that enormous debt, as many prominent people in official positions are advocating today, that means \$6,000,000,000 a year interest, and it will be impossible for the people to pay that much interest and the running expenses of this Government; which will mean that the people of this Nation will be in perpetual bondage or there will be repudiation of the national debt.

MAKE PAYMENTS ON PRINCIPAL OF BONDS INSTEAD OF ON THE INTEREST

Now, there is a way to escape that situation, and an orthodox way to escape it, by paying a certain amount each year on the principal of the bonds, instead of paying it as interest. The proposal that has been brought forward is that if the Government needs a billion dollars in money, the Government, through the Secretary of the Treasury, issues a billion dollars of non-interest-bearing notes, and distributes those notes among the 12 Federal Reserve banks in proportion of their resources, of course, and receives credit for the United States Treasury to the amount of \$1,000,000,000. Then every year instead of paying 4-percent or 3-percent interest, as we are doing today, pay 3 percent on the face of the bonds, on the principal. In that way you will reduce the bonds every year, and the inflation becomes less severe, every year less inflationary, and in 33½ years the entire public debt will be liquidated. If you do not do that and pay 3-percent interest—and we will never be able to pay more than just the interest—at the end of 33½ years we will still owe the billion dollars, just like at the end of 33½ years we will still owe the \$150,000,000,000—perpetual bondage for the people.

USE GOVERNMENT CREDIT INSTEAD OF FARMING IT OUT TO BANKS FREE

In order to do what I suggest you will use the credit of the Nation instead of farming it out absolutely free to the private commercial banks of this country. If you desire to use the \$23,000,000,000 in gold that we have that is now idle and unused as backing for those bonds, you can do that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. May I suggest to you that if the Government issues non-interest-bearing bonds and places them with the Federal Reserve banks, as has been suggested, the backing behind those bonds will be exactly the same as if the Government had issued a billion dollars of 3-percent bonds and placed them with the 12 Federal Reserve banks.

If there is any person within the sound of my voice who can say that the security will be less, I will yield to him now for that purpose. But no one can say it. There is exactly the same security behind each.

So why should this Congress sit idly by and place our people in perpetual bond-

age just because some person might say that the best way to get money is to have it created by the commercial banks and pay them an interest rate for its creation?

PEOPLE WILL EVENTUALLY BLAME US

May I suggest to you that the people of this country one of these days will blame you. They will blame me. They will blame the entire Congress and the administration for sitting idly by and letting these 50-year bonds, providing for 2 and 3 percent interest and more be issued and sold to the American people.

I am in favor of selling defense bonds to individuals and corporations that do not create the money with which to buy them. I favor that very much, because it has a tendency to retard or cut down or stop inflation. But I am very much opposed to the sale of interest-bearing bonds to money-creating corporations. To date the commercial banks have done an excellent job. I am not trying to destroy commercial banks. They are very necessary and highly desirable institutions. The stockholders of all the banks in the Nation have invested \$8,000,000,000 only. That is all they would lose if every bank were to close its doors. Upon that investment they have already loaned the Government \$21,000,000,000, upon which they are receiving interest annually. In addition to that, they have made loans and investments aggregating about \$10 to every \$1 that they have.

I am not objecting to that, let them do it, it is in the interest of the country, especially certain sections of the country, at times to have a bank expansion; but why permit them to lend 20-to-1, or 30-to-1, or 40-to-1, or 50-to-1 when the loan is made upon the credit of this Nation? I express the hope that this Congress will stop the use of our Government's credit free and the forcing of this Government to pay an annual tribute of billions of dollars upon this war debt and place our people in perpetual bondage.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, we have a long bill to complete this afternoon, and progress thus far has been discouragingly slow. We have been very liberal in debate, much of which has not pertained to the bill. I wonder if we could make a little more rapid progress from now on? I do not want to shut anyone off, I do not want to object, but I would appreciate a little cooperation in trying to expedite matters.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the matter of printing cost which was touched on a short while ago is very important, something that costs us a great many millions of dollars. During my membership on the Committee on Printing I have been zealous in trying to do a good job, trying to cut down on the amount of printing

and trying to save money on this item. My purpose in rising at this time is to call the attention of the Members to how each one of these bills carries items for printing for the various departments. Take the pending bill: On page 5 you will see an item of printing and binding for the Secretary, \$26,600. On page 7 is an item of printing and binding for the Bureau of Accounts, \$28,000, and another item on the same page for printing and binding for the Division of Disbursement, \$53,900.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. RICH. I should like to complete this statement first, then I will yield; I shall have plenty of time.

On page 10 is an item for printing and binding for the Bureau of the Public Debt, \$12,000. On page 11, printing and binding for the Office of the Treasurer, \$22,000. On page 14, printing and binding for the Bureau of Customs, \$61,000. Page 14, printing and binding for the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, \$25,000. Page 21, printing and binding for the Bureau of Narcotics, \$5,000. Page 23, printing and binding for the Bureau of Printing and Engraving, \$5,500. Page 23, printing and binding for the Secret Service Division, \$4,000. Page 25, printing and binding for the Bureau of the Mint, \$6,300. Page 31, printing and binding for the Procurement Division, \$161,500. Page 33, printing and binding for the Post Office Department, \$1,080,000.

This totals over \$1,500,000. This is but one of the annual appropriation bills. You will find in all the appropriation bills items asking large amounts for printing and binding. The Appropriations Committee are at the mercy of these departments, because they just hound and hound us; and nobody tries to cut them down more than the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]. He is always trying to cut these items down. But we want to impress upon you the fact that the Appropriations Committee is bound by the laws you pass building up these various bureaus and departments which need printing and binding in order to function.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. I just wanted to say that I have always been sympathetic with the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] toward economy. At the same time, however, we want to be just with reference to the bureaus, and there is more than appears on the surface in these items. The printing here provided for is not for the dissemination of propaganda but for necessary printing to enable the departments to function, the printing of the necessary forms for the work of the bureaus. Take, for instance, the Bureau of Internal Revenue and consider the tremendous amount used to pay for the forms they send out in the collection of taxes—forms which you get and every other citizen gets. The Bureau is constantly working to reduce the cost of this printing. Then there is the Bureau of Customs, the Bureau of Accounts. All of them without exception use this printing item for the pro-

curement of necessary forms and other matter that must go out to their offices and to the public. As to propaganda, yes, let us stop it; but in order to be fair to the bureaus, let us know how much of this is really necessary for forms without which they could not carry on the business of the bureau.

Mr. RICH. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky. He is right. As I said before, he is most zealous in his effort to cut down unnecessary expenses; but there are still certain cuts that could be made in these printing and binding items that would make a saving.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, \$25,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Last night we listened to Eddie Flynn on the radio. There must have been something the matter with him for he wants to deny the right of free speech, of a free press, to the Republicans. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Knutson] spoke today, and if I understood him correctly he made the statement that he thought Flynn must have gone to a cocktail party and was one of the first to get there. If my ears did not deceive me, down went the Speaker's gavel, although I do not know how the Speaker got the floor, and the Speaker made the remark that Mr. Flynn does not drink. Now, that is all right. Nobody cares whether he does or he does not drink, but if he had not been drinking, and I assume he had not been, something must have been wrong with his head from some other cause, because in this land where we have the four freedoms the head of the National Democratic Organization should not get up and because the Republican Party has hired a publicity man state that the Republican Party is more interested in the preservation of the party than it is in winning the war. Surely there is something wrong with a man who makes such a statement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Salaries and expenses: For salaries and expenses in connection with the assessment and collection of internal-revenue taxes and the administration of the internal-revenue laws, including the administration of such provisions of other laws as are authorized by or pursuant to law to be administered by or under the direction of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, including one stamp agent (to be reimbursed by the stamp manufacturers) and the employment of experts; the securing of evidence of violations of the acts, the cost of chemical analyses made by others than employees of the United States and expenses incident to such chemists testifying when necessary; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by act of October 10, 1940 (Public No. 839), and regulations promulgated thereunder; telegraph and telephone service, postage, freight, express, necessary expenses incurred in making investigations in connection with the enrollment or disbarment of practitioners before the Treasury Department in internal-revenue matters, expenses of seizure and sale, and other necessary miscellaneous expenses, including stenographic reporting services; for the acquisition

of property under the provisions of title III of the Liquor Law Repeal and Enforcement Act, approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 872-881), and the operation, maintenance, and repair of property acquired under such title III; for the purchase (not to exceed \$2), exchange, hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary, for official use of the Alcohol Tax and Intelligence Units in field work; printing and binding (not to exceed \$931,850); and the procurement of such supplies, stationery (not to exceed \$468,000), equipment, furniture, mechanical devices, laboratory supplies, periodicals and newspapers for the Alcohol Tax Unit, ammunition, lawbooks and books of reference, and such other articles as may be necessary, \$80,908,940, of which amount not to exceed \$10,834,002 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not more than \$100,000 of the total amount appropriated herein may be expended by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for detecting and bringing to trial persons guilty of violating the internal-revenue laws or conniving at the same, including payments for information and detection of such violation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 16, line 6, after "necessary", strike out "\$80,908,940" and insert "\$79,408,940."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to reduce the increase in the appropriation for the Bureau of Internal Revenue by \$1,500,000. The increase in this bill over last year's appropriation is \$8,579,865.

My experience with this Bureau is that their appropriation has gone up better than 50 percent in the last few years. My experience is that they have taken in employees faster than they have been able to train them so they can be efficient. If we give them as much money as we do, and do not put the brakes on, we shall have an octopus instead of a service organization. I am hopeful that we may reduce this appropriation a little and see if we cannot keep them from putting on so many persons that they are not able to keep them in order and keep them trained properly.

I am painfully aware of the necessity of trying to do something to keep the different Government departments from expanding so rapidly in these times. They come in with a story of what they have had and with a great big story of what they are going to have to do, and they get increases where they put on the pressure like that which are altogether beyond what is necessary.

The reduction I propose is so small in proportion to the amount of the increase, less than 20 percent of the proposed increase, that it will not be as effectual as I should like it to be, but it will be an invitation to them to see that they do not take on so many untrained and useless employees.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think all of us who were privileged to hear the testimony before our subcommittee were greatly impressed by the enormous load that is now placed on the Bureau of Internal Revenue and that will be on the Bureau of Internal Revenue under the new tax

law. Further, this burden will be further augmented by prospective tax legislation, which is certain to be enacted soon. I think we were convinced that the appropriation we have allowed will be very inadequate in the last analysis to cover all the necessary expenditure.

I call attention to the fact that the tax law of 1941, which is just becoming effective and which is expected to bring \$3,500,000,000 annually into the Treasury, will increase by 6,108,000 the number of income-tax returns and will bring 5,500,000 more taxpayers into the picture—persons who never before have paid taxes.

The load on the Bureau is enormous, and it is increasing. As I said before, the amount we have allowed will in all probability be far short of meeting the actual requirements for the fiscal year 1943, in view of the prospect that there is other tax legislation in the offing. I think it would be a great mistake to reduce the amount we have allowed, because I believe every dollar of it will be needed. I hope and trust the amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 33, noes 34.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the Procurement Division, including printed forms and miscellaneous items for general use of the Treasury Department, the cost of transportation to field offices of printed and bound material and the cost of necessary packing boxes and packing materials, \$161,500, together with not to exceed \$4,000 to be transferred from the general supply fund, Treasury Department.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 31, after line 10, add a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 2. No part of any money appropriated in this title shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee who engages in, or directs or authorizes any other officer or employee to engage in, the carrying out of section 3 of the act approved June 19, 1934, known as the Silver Purchase Act of 1934."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can assure my good friend from Indiana that the amendment is in order, but it is quite all right for him to reserve the point.

Mr. Chairman, this probably represents my sixth attempt in as many years to nullify if possible the program under the Silver Purchase Act of 1934. I find real gratification in the fact that today I stand in the corner not only of the Secretary of the Treasury but of the 200 leading economists of the United States, who have referred to the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 as the greatest folly of the last generation. In that advised opinion I entirely concur.

We have been at it for 7 years. The Secretary of the Treasury has no option in the matter. By virtue of that statute

he is under a mandate, directed by the Congress, to continue to purchase silver bullion until either the price goes to \$1.29 an ounce or until the ratio of silver to gold in our monetary system is as 1 to 3.

We have been buying silver for 7 years. We have purchased thus far 2,477,000,000 ounces. Think of it, nearly 2,500,000,000 ounces of silver. For that silver we paid one and one-third billion dollars.

We are still 9 percent from the goal. The ratio shall be as 25 to 75 percent. Notwithstanding all these purchases, the Secretary's own testimony in these hearings shows that we have only 16 percent of silver in relation to the gold. The reason we are like that bird in Africa that walks backward, and the longer it walks the farther it gets from its goal, is that the gold-purchase program continues, so that as we continue to purchase gold we get further away from the goal of 25 percent of silver.

We have 18½ ounces of silver for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Someone should introduce a bill to cast all of this silver in the form of fine, initialed teaspoons and deliver to every man, woman, and child in the United States four dozen teaspoons. This would be no more stupid than what we are doing today. That is why the Secretary of the Treasury, on page 404 of these hearings, stated:

So far as I am concerned, I will be glad to see Congress strike all the silver legislation from the books.

We have subsidized a handful of silver producers to the extent of \$600,000,000, and to show you how dangerous this thing is, the number of silver certificates in our currency system has increased from \$401,000,000 in 1934 to \$1,713,000,000 in 1941.

With the Treasury against it, with every thinking economist in the field of finance against it, we still persist in this folly. There is only one way to get action on it, and that is a delimiting amendment that will stop those who are engaged in this business down in the Treasury Department from getting any pay if they undertake to buy or direct the purchase of silver under section 3 of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934.

Are we going to continue with the greatest folly of the generation which is inflating the currency and piling up a huge hoard of worthless silver which will contain many a headache, not only in the near future but when the post-war readjustment comes? Every man in this Congress today should stand up and vote to nullify what the Secretary of the Treasury says ought to be stricken from the books. His language at page 404 is, "I would be glad to see Congress strike it from the books." Let us enhance and augment the gladness of the man who conducts the finances of the country today. Let us stand up as a Congress and nullify this specious and fallacious piece of legislation. Had the one and one-third billion dollars which we have invested in useless silver been invested in copper, which is so badly needed today in our defense and war preparations, it would have purchased 4,000,000 tons of such copper. While that is today a futile wish, we at least need not persist in this

folly, and the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have read the amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I am convinced it is not subject to a point of order, and I therefore withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that personally I have a great deal of sympathy with the objective which my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] seeks to accomplish. I think the Silver Purchase Act is an indefensible subsidy. If he would introduce a bill and let it take the regular legislative course, I would talk turkey with him on it because I really have strong convictions on the same side that the gentleman is on with respect to this proposition, but this is altogether an improper way of getting at the matter. This is a question that involves a great national policy, and it is contrary to good practice to undertake to nullify an existing law of such vast importance by a provision in an appropriation bill. It would set a bad precedent that might come home to haunt us many times.

I ask the Committee to vote down the amendment and at the same time I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois, for whom I have the warmest admiration, that he approach his objective in a different way and in the right direction, by submitting the matter to the appropriate legislative committee so that it may take the regular course as it should and secure the sanction of a legislative committee after hearings and after due consideration of the entire matter. I think this is the right course to pursue and I hope the Committee will adopt this attitude and vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Ludlow) there were—ayes 38, noes 34.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. Ludlow and Mr. DIRKSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 53, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Post office stationery, equipment, and supplies: For stationery for the Postal Service, including the money-order and registry system; and also for the purchase of supplies for the Postal Savings System, including rubber stamps, canceling devices, certificates, envelopes, and stamps for use in evidencing deposits, and free penalty envelopes; and for the reimbursement of the Secretary of the Treasury for expenses incident to the preparation, issue, and registration of the bonds authorized by the act of June 25, 1910 (39 U. S. C. 760); for miscellaneous equipment and supplies, including the purchase and repair of furniture, package boxes, posts, trucks, baskets, satchels, straps, letter-box paint, baling machines, perforating machines, stamp vending and postage meter devices, duplicating machines, printing presses, directories, cleaning supplies, and the manufacture, repair, and

exchange of equipment, the erection and painting of letter-box equipment, and for the purchase and repair of presses and dies for use in the manufacture of letter boxes; for postmarking, rating, money-order stamps, and electrotype plates and repairs to same; metal, rubber, and combination type, dates and figures, type holders, ink pads for canceling and stamping purposes, and for the purchase, exchange, and repair of typewriting machines, envelope-opening machines, and computing machines, numbering machines, time recorders, letter balances, scales (exclusive of dormant or built-in platform scales in Federal buildings), test weights, and miscellaneous articles purchased and furnished directly to the Postal Service, including complete equipment and furniture for post offices in leased and rented quarters; for the purchase (including exchange), repair, and replacement of arms and miscellaneous items necessary for the protection of the mails; for miscellaneous expenses in the preparation and publication of post-route maps and rural-delivery maps or blueprints, including tracing for photolithographic reproduction; for other expenditures necessary and incidental to post offices of the first, second, and third classes, and offices of the fourth class having or to have rural-delivery service, and for letter boxes; for the purchase of atlases and geographical and technical works not to exceed \$1,500; for wrapping twine and tying devices (not more than three-fourths of the funds herein appropriated for the purchase of twine shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from materials or commodities produced outside the United States; for expenses incident to the shipment of supplies, including hardware, boxing, packing, and not exceeding \$63,800 for the pay of employees in connection therewith in the District of Columbia; for rental, purchase, exchange, and repair of canceling machines and motors, mechanical mail-handling apparatus, accident prevention, and other labor-saving devices, including cost of power in rented buildings and miscellaneous expenses of installation and operation of same, including not to exceed \$35,000 for salaries of 13 traveling mechanics, and for traveling expenses, \$3,700,000: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may authorize the sale to the public of post-route maps and rural delivery maps or blueprints at the cost of printing and 10 percent thereof added.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to ask a question in regard to an item on page 44, as follows:

for wrapping twine and tying devices (not more than three-fourths of the funds herein appropriated for the purchase of twine shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from materials or commodities produced outside the United States);

I understand that is the same provision that was in the bill last year?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes. It has been carried for several years.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, that is all. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Vehicle service: For vehicle service; the hire of vehicles; the rental of garage facilities; the purchase, exchange, maintenance, and repair of motor vehicles, including the repair of vehicles owned by, or under the control of, units of the National Guard and departments and agencies of the Federal Government where repairs are made necessary because of utilization of such vehicles in the Postal Service; accident prevention; the hire of supervisors, clerical assistance, mechanics, drivers, garagemen, and such other employees as may be necessary in providing vehicles and vehicle service for use in the collection,

transportation, delivery, and supervision of the mail, and United States official mail and messenger service, \$16,262,900: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, in his disbursement of this appropriation, apply a part thereof to the leasing of quarters for the housing of Government-owned motor vehicles at a reasonable annual rental for a term not exceeding 10 years: *Provided further*, That the Postmaster General, during the fiscal year 1943 may purchase and maintain from the appropriation "Vehicle service" such tractors and trailer trucks as may be required in the operation of the vehicle service: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance or repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for use in connection with the administrative work of the Post Office Department in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORAND: Page 47, line 16, after the colon, insert "*Provided further*, That the classification of substitute driver-mechanic created by the Reclassification Act of 1925 shall be adhered to and that no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of substitute driver-mechanics at a rate of pay other than the rate of 65 cents per hour."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to withhold his point of order.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Rhode Island concedes the point of order. I withhold the point of order for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the amendment I am offering is subject to the point of order, and I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Indiana in permitting me to speak for a few moments. My reason for offering the amendment is because of an injustice which has been done over a period of years, since 1930, to driver-mechanics in the Post Office service. These driver-mechanics were in the Classification Act of 1925 given a separate and official classification, but in 1930 the Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission entered into an agreement which ignored the law completely, and had the effect of changing the classification of driver-mechanics to garagemen-drivers, by eliminating examinations for the higher grade, which meant that these men would be paid 55 cents an hour instead of 65 cents an hour. During the last session of Congress the House passed H. R. 2077, which sought to remedy that situation, but another body shelved the bill and no action was taken upon it, excepting that the Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission again got together and reached an agreement whereby when substitute garagemen-drivers are used as driver-mechanics, they would receive 65 cents an hour during the period actually assigned to that job.

I invite the attention of Members of the House, because I do not care to take up too much time on the floor, to the statement in the hearings at page 386

of Mr. Paul M. Castiglioni, the legislative representative, National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees. There they will see this case set out in toto, and I am sure they will be sympathetic if further legislation is brought to the floor on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana insist upon the point of order?

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Rhode Island concedes the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the Post Office Department Appropriation Act, 1943.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, within the last hour 3 aged veterans from the Soldiers' Home in Washington have furnished me a petition containing three and one-half pages of typewritten matter from occupants of the United States Soldiers' Home, now having some 1,400 members. They furnished me a petition signed by more than 900 of the occupants of the home and ask that I present to the Congress this, their petition.

It is my information that this property was acquired by the United States Government as a soldiers' home about 90 years ago. It is now proposed by some groups of people in Washington that they take over this property for the purpose of converting it into a housing project under the emergency of national defense—another one of the many things that is being cloaked in the robes of national defense interests in order to do something that ought not be done.

It is my information that the title to this property contains a bar against that kind of procedure; that it contains a restrictive clause which provided that this should not be done. I am not asserting this as a fact, but that is my information from these gentlemen. That provision provides that if and when the property is converted to any other use than the use for which it was intended—that is, a home for disabled soldiers—the title shall revert to the heirs or the estate of the donor or grantor, as the case may have been. Of course, that is a complete statutory bar to taking it except with that condition.

I simply present this petition on behalf of those old soldiers, with the hope that the Members of the House will read it, and if and when there is a proposal in the Appropriations Committee or the House Military Affairs Committee, or any other committee of Congress that due notice will be taken of the right of these dependent defenders of our country.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include this petition therewith.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The petition referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1942.

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned, members of the United States Soldiers' Home, respectfully request your interest and protection in behalf of the thousands of veterans throughout the United States who are now entitled to the benefits of this home.

1. This home was established by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1851. By this act the Congress retained under its own jurisdiction the trusteeship for the old, infirm, and disabled soldiers of the Regular Army. The Regular Army veterans, therefore, have no one to look to for protection save the Congress and, in the 91 years of the existence of this home, they have never petitioned in vain. We know that we shall not be denied your protection now. For now we are under attack. Commercial interests are trying, under the guise of national defense, and civilian requirements, to get our property away from us and have proposed to send us "down the river" to land less desirable.

2. At this same time every effort is being made by the Park Commissioners to provide adequate parks and places of amusement for the residents of the District of Columbia. Now, what is this land but a public park? And it was the first such public park in the District of Columbia, maintained without one cent of cost to the taxpayer of either the District or the National Government. The entire cost of maintaining this home is paid by the enlisted man on the active list of the Regular Army. With the exception of the actual living quarters of the members in barracks and hospital, every bit of this land constitutes a public park of which there are all too few in the District. A glance at the record will show the following facilities of the reservation to be available to the public generally:

(a) Over 11 miles of surfaced roads within our gates open for traffic. We pay all costs of maintenance.

(b) Our gates are open 24 hours a day for public traffic, and over 99 percent of the traffic is by the public.

(c) Our grounds are extensively used as playgrounds for children, adults, their families and friends.

(d) In winter we provide sledding hills for children and adults with protection against harm by our own local police.

(e) At Easter we provide egg-rolling lawns for crowds even greater than can be accommodated at the White House because we have a greater expanse of lawn.

(f) Throughout the entire summer we have evening band concerts attended by a large number of residents of the District of Columbia and visiting tourists.

(g) Sightseeing busses have the home on their itineraries and, recognizing it as one of the beauty spots of the District of Columbia, bring a large number of tourists here. Those who appreciate the beauty of the grand panoramic view of the entire city of Washington and the magnificent forest of trees have no wish to see these destroyed to make room for concrete buildings or commercial activities.

(h) We have built and maintain baseball fields for the children of the surrounding community who use it freely, never realizing for a moment that this is not a public park. They think it is.

(i) Howard University is authorized to drill and train its Reserve Officers' Training Corps recruits on designated grounds.

(j) During the school year at least three grades from kindergarten through high school visit the home dairy and chicken farm weekly—frequently coming in busses accompanied by their teachers. College and university students and constituents of Members of Congress, particularly from rural districts, in the city on sightseeing tours visit and inspect the modern dairy and thoroughbred

Holstein herd of cattle, both from interest and educational purposes.

We are very proud of the historic honor which has been bestowed upon this home in the past when the soldiers of the Regular Army here were given the privilege of entertaining, as a summer White House, three Presidents of the United States; namely, Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Buchanan, and Mr. Hayes.

3. We not only live in this community and have our large groups of friends here among the residential population, but as a group we contribute freely out of the meager compensation we receive to every charitable activity in Washington; in fact, we are among the first to be approached when the Red Cross, the Community Chest, the Mile of Dimes, and others need help.

4. It has been estimated that there are now at least 2,000,000 veterans living all over the United States, who by their personal contributions have established their eligibility for membership in this home and who have a paid-up interest in it, even though they do not find it convenient to come here until they get old or need hospitalization. There may be added to this many more veterans of the present terrible combat. For the boys now in service there is nothing too good, and it is our hope that we may keep this home for them also. It may be stated here that of the number of resident members in this home at the present time, over 500 served in the World War; it is our firm belief that the citizens of the United States did not look upon us as parasites 20 years ago, and our brothers in service at this time should not look forward to being called parasites 20 years hence.

5. This home is our pride, the pride of the soldiers of the Regular Army. It has taken the contributions of several millions of them to build and maintain it, and we speak for each and every one of them when we ask you, as our duly constituted trustees, to protect our interests and insure that this institution shall remain forever intact, to be passed on to future old, infirm, and disabled members of the Regular Army in the same splendid condition, or even better, than when we received it from our predecessors.

6. In conclusion, we wish to go on record and assure you that we have the utmost confidence in the officers of this home, and we ask that before Congress ever even considers any proposition to destroy the effectiveness of this home, or its property, that no action be taken until after the officers of this home, its board of commissioners, and, above all, its governor, Maj. Gen. Frederick W. Coleman, have been heard from. General Coleman will speak well for us and for the millions of other veterans who have established an eligibility for this home; we know that he will leave nothing undone in our behalf.

Very respectfully yours,

BENJAMIN I. MOTLEY,

CHARLES M. ARMSTRONG,

HERMAN VEAN,

Committee, Representing Members,
United States Soldiers' Home,
Washington, D. C.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOEHNE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6511, directed him to report

the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the passage of the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight in which to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 6460, the Navy Department appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WARTIME CENSORSHIP AND BUSINESS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most drastic adjustments businessmen must make in wartime is in the matter of news censorship.

We all appreciate the necessity for concealing troop movements and military operations from the enemy. This is accomplished today by a rigid and all-embracing censorship of press and radio, from Washington. The office of censorship, established last month, is conducting this work with a daily expanding force. Within 2 months, we are told, this agency will have a total of 10,000 men and women on its staff. It will censor all news and radio reports from Washington as well as all international mail, and all telephone conversations across the national boundaries.

The list of news material which may not be printed is a long one, and while this military news does not relate directly to the daily operations of business, it does nevertheless often influence decisions on business policies and programs. In a sense, therefore, businessmen must accustom themselves to operating with only such news as the Government sees fit to give them.

As to general policy in this matter of the news censorship, it may be summed up in the statement that when there is good news available it will be given to the public promptly. This, then, reverses the old maxim, and we must condition our-

selves to the fact that sometimes no news may be bad news.

THE BUDGET AND NATIONAL DEBT

Perhaps the question uppermost in mind for the informed citizen today relates to the Federal Budget and the fiscal position of the Nation in the light of the enlarged war demands.

Two great facts stand out as we approach this problem. The first is that a Federal debt of \$110,000,000,000 is now anticipated by the end of the next fiscal year, on June 30, 1943.

The second fact to bear in mind in connection with Federal spending relates to the maximum productive capacity of our national plant and equipment. To put it another way, there appears to be some solid ground for questioning whether the Government can spend as much on industrial production over the next 18 months as has been planned and outlined in recent official utterances and blueprints.

Modern mechanical warfare requires about 18 producers and distributors behind the lines for every active combatant. On this basis, an armed force of 7,000,000 men would require 126,000,000 men and women working behind the lines of battle. Our present employed labor force is about 55,000,000 men and women.

Neither can we neglect the fact that the demands made upon our American resources in this war are tremendously greater, in relation to our total productive capacity, than the demands made upon us in the first World War, 25 years ago.

Our official commitments abroad for food and military equipment and supplies now literally reach around the world—to the Netherlands Indies, Australia, Malaya, China, India, Alaska, Hawaii, South America, England, Iceland, Russia, Ireland, and Africa.

It has escaped general public attention, for example, that Secretary of Agriculture Wickard testified in the last lend-lease hearings, in November, that our food program alone was based upon the assumption that the United States, under lend-lease, would feed approximately one-fourth of the total population of Great Britain, or roundly 10,000,000 people. Thus, aside from whatever assistance we may extend in other quarters, we have already, during the past year, seated 10,000,000 nonpaying guests at the American table, in addition to the 132,000,000 people already there. And during the last month the President has taken steps to send vast quantities of food to Russia.

This obviously calls for a considerable increase in American agricultural production, which, in turn, calls for a prompt increase in farm labor at a time when both the military draft and the defense industries are taking large numbers of young men from the farms—a basic problem confronting American agriculture, as well as all our food industries today.

Meanwhile, we have recent experience to guide us as to the general direction we are traveling in fiscal affairs. Federal revenues for the last 6 months of 1941 were about 35 percent higher than

the same months of 1940. However, total Federal expenditures in the last half of 1941 were 125 percent higher than the corresponding months of the previous year.

During the first 8 years of the present administration, the average Federal expenditure was roughly \$2 for every \$1 of income. But during the last 6 months, expenditures have advanced to approximately \$3 for every \$1 of income. If we assume that the spending program will broaden as much in the next 6 months as in the last, we will soon be spending \$4 for every \$1 of revenue.

Another way to measure this problem is to look at the current Federal deficit. For the last 6 months of 1940 the average daily deficit of the Federal Government was, in round numbers, twelve and one-fourth million dollars. But for the last 6 months of 1941 the average daily deficit was \$40,150,000.

This means that it would require an additional tax load, over and above everything now in effect, of about \$1.30 per day for every family in the United States to put today's Federal spending on a pay-as-you-go basis. The impact of an additional tax load of \$40 per month for every family today is, of course, unthinkable. Yet that is the real measure of our Federal deficit at this time.

In this connection, the so-called Byrd committee recently pointed out that a billion dollars could be saved annually by cutting unnecessary nondefense expenditures. It is, therefore, urgent that Congress and the President immediately give serious consideration to these proposals in order that all possible savings be made in nondefense Government expenditures.

NEW TAXES

New taxes likewise present an acute problem for all business. After the new \$5,000,000,000 tax increase enacted last fall, there is now a demand from the President for additional revenues to the extent of \$7,000,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000 a year. The Ways and Means Committee of the House will begin work on this new measure after the 1st of February, and the final bill will probably be enacted in March or April of this year, retroactive as to all income taxes to January 1, 1942.

Certain principles emerge in these discussions as of vital importance to business. The first is that American industry cannot carry the whole tax burden by itself. There is ground for question now whether, in the matter of corporate and individual income-tax rates, our Federal schedules have not already reached the point of diminishing returns. I feel that there is a growing disposition in Congress to seek new sources of revenue rather than merely to pile new rates on top of the present business taxes. There is likewise a growing conviction that business must be allowed to build up and maintain adequate operating reserves. Everyone recognizes that vast reserves will be required sometime to convert our industries back from a war basis to peacetime production. Unless such reserves are piled up out of present income, the period of conversion will find

many industries without the funds needed to keep them going in the transition period back to nondefense operations. Such a situation would produce widespread unemployment and unnecessary suffering, not to mention the tribulations of bankruptcy and reorganization in tens of thousands of plants. Industrial reserves must, to some extent, be protected in new tax legislation.

There is a growing recognition that Congress must look to a general sales tax, or possibly a pay-roll tax, as one important source of new revenues. There is division of opinion as between the Federal Reserve authorities and the Treasury as to which of these measures would contribute most to checking inflation. My belief is that we should not attempt to accomplish general legislative programs through tax measures. Our tax bills should be designed to raise revenues; and if we then have other problems relating to inflation, or other social objectives, they should be handled as general-policy legislation and not disguised as tax bills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CONGRESS HELPS ITSELF TO PENSIONS BUT TURNS THUMBS DOWN ON PENSIONS FOR OLD PEOPLE IN NEED

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the Congress voting its Members pensions before providing for a reasonable and decent annuity system for all of our old people who have attained the age of 60 years and who are unemployed. Their needs are infinitely greater than is the need of ex-Members of Congress. This is no time for Congress to help itself to pensions out of the Federal Treasury while turning thumbs down on pensions for old people who are in great need.

The bill which was recently passed by the Congress and signed by the President (H. R. 3487, Public Law 411, 77th Cong.), has a provision permitting Members of Congress to elect to come under its provisions if they elect to do so. Thereafter they are required to pay 5 percent of their salary, and upon retiring from Congress, after 5 years' service only and having attained the age of 62 years, will be entitled to a pension, the minimum being about \$47.92 per month, subject to increase for longer service, with an additional provision to permit a Member to pay back contributions which would increase the annuity.

I am advised by the Civil Service Commission that the approximate estimated pensions for ex-Congressmen under this law are as follows:

Service	Age at retirement	Pension
5 years.....	62	\$575, without contribution.
Do.....	62	\$710, with contribution.
10 years.....	62	\$1,100, without contribution.
Do.....	62	\$1,425, with contribution.
15 years.....	62	\$2,125, with contribution.

Believing as I do that pensions for old people should come first, before pensions for lame-duck Congressmen, I voted

against the bill last year providing pensions for Congressmen and I did not vote for it when it was before us this year. The bill passed, H. R. 3487, contains many amendments to the Civil Service Retirement Act and no opportunity was offered for a separate vote against this particular provision providing pensions for Members of Congress. In my judgment, we should take steps at once to repeal the provision of the law authorizing Congressmen to elect to come under its pension provisions. I have, therefore, introduced a bill, H. R. 6508, to repeal the pension provision for Congressmen in this law.

My complaint is not necessarily with the merits of a proposal to permit Congressmen upon retirement to receive a pension under certain conditions, but I believe they should not have priority over our old folks who are in greater need, and I therefore believe that a uniform pension program covering all of our old people, which, of course, would include Congressmen, is more equitable and just and should have first consideration.

As an indication as to how the public generally view this legislation, I include two editorials from the two leading newspapers of my district discussing the problem:

[From the Portland Oregonian of January 31, 1942]

THOSE CONGRESSIONAL PENSIONS

It is indicated by a number of letters received from protesting correspondents that an erroneous impression is around that Congress has voted its Members a pension of \$4,000 upon retirement from office. Two letters on the subject are printed today.

Congress did pass an act permitting elective members of the legislative and executive branches of Government to participate, at their option, in salary deductions and the retirement benefits of the Federal Civil Service Retirement Act of 1920. Members of Congress who decide to accept the act will contribute 5 percent of salary to the retirement fund, and receive when and if they retire at eligible age, annual payments graduated according to salary and length of service. The retirement pay would amount to \$4,000 only when the Member had had a service of about 30 years. Twelve years' service (two terms in the Senate, 6 in the House) would entitle the Member, if he had reached the retirement age, to retirement pay of \$1,284; lesser tenure would mean proportionately smaller benefit.

One of the controversial phases in the Senate was over the fact that Members who have already served the minimum of 5 years and attained the age of 62 could retire and obtain the benefits of the act without assessment against back years' salary. In the debate over this particular, Senator BYRD pointed out that if a Member had been in the Senate since 1907 and should retire next January he would be able to draw more than \$4,000 annually from the fund, and would pay only part of 1 year's assessment, or about \$200. This was an extreme illustration but the hypothetical figure apparently is the basis for the impression that Congress granted one and all of its Members \$4,000 retirement pensions.

There are two points that perhaps invite discussion: One is whether latecomers into a mutually sustained retirement system should without cost to them be given the same benefits as those who have been paying into the fund over a period of years; the other is whether Congress should vote its Members into a system which obligates Government itself to contribute up to an even amount with employees when and if employee assessments are not enough to meet withdrawals, and is

moreover a system in which Congress establishes the scales of contribution and distribution.

[From the Portland Journal of January 30, 1942]

PENSION PLUMS FOR CONGRESS MEMBERS

A reader of this page wants to know how Representatives and Senators of the Congress pushed themselves under the wire for Federal pensions. Or, to quote the questions more exactly:

"What percent of each pension is to be paid by the pensioners and what part by the taxpayers? In what amounts are the pensions? Will length of time in office govern the size of the pension, and at what age will ex-Congressmen and women be given the income?"

Information at hand is a bit vague about what the Member of the Congress pays and what the taxpayers pay. The Senators and Representatives elect whether they will start to pay about \$41.50 a month into the fund. The inquirer may wish to figure what percentage that is of a \$10,000 annual salary. To retire, a Congressman must be at least 62 and must have served at least 5 years.

The same bill that grants the Congressmen pensions also increases from 3½ to 5 percent the premium deductions of Federal job holders and makes 70 the uniform retirement age for civilian employees.

Yes; it looks as if the Members had been picking plums for themselves out of the Federal cake. But before we close the subject, more information will be sought.

Mr. Speaker, while considering pensions, in my judgment the Congress should at this time take up for consideration the proposal which has been pending before the Congress for some time providing adequate pensions for our old people. I refer to H. R. 1036, generally known as the Townsend proposal. There is a discharge petition on the Clerk's desk which has been signed by a number of our colleagues, but an insufficient number to bring the proposal before the House for consideration. Now with war upon us, with living expenses very materially advanced, and the meager income of these old people, who cannot take part as employees in the war program, being wholly insufficient to care for their needs, the time is ripe that we do something about it. The national income is headed toward \$100,000,000,000 and the Secretary of the Treasury has warned the Congress that we are headed toward inflation unless brakes are applied to excessive spending—all spending beyond bare necessities.

We are in a better position at this time to inaugurate a pension program for our old people than we have ever been before. I therefore urge you, my colleagues, to join with me in the repeal of the pension provision we recently passed for ex-Members of the Congress, and to sign the discharge petition to bring H. R. 1036 on the floor that full debate and discussion may be had on the whole subject of old-age pensions, and a program enacted into law without further delay that will give adequate relief to our old people now so much in need.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include two editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an article by Malcolm W. Bingay, which appeared in a recent issue of the Detroit Free Press.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next after the conclusion of the legislative business for the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wilson] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WARTIME EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I want first to make a statement in regard to such blame as may inadvertently have been cast upon the stenographers employed by Mr. Knudsen. The record of the hearings before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will show that I stated that Mr. Knudsen referred me to another gentleman in the O. P. M. whose stenographer typed a letter three times, a letter consisting of about five lines, before he would sign that letter. That is no reflection on Mr. Knudsen's stenographers, as the record of the committee hearings will show; and I want to absolve them of all blame.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me a special edition of the Evening Star which has not yet appeared on the streets. It contains a picture—a deplorable thing—a picture of employees who have been brought to Washington, who have been here for several weeks, who have been on the pay roll but have not as yet touched a pencil to paper or the key of a typewriter. I want to read you just what appears underneath this picture:

These are employed war workers. This group is only a portion of those crowded into a third-floor room of temporary Building H, War Department, Twenty-second and C Streets NW., today on the War Department pay roll and waiting assignment to jobs. Meanwhile these young employees have no work to do, and many, as can be observed, have nowhere to sit down. Some have been waiting as long as 3 weeks, they told a Star reporter, and have had pay days meanwhile. They report daily at 8 a. m., wait in the crowded room all day or until their names are called, and they are sent to some office.

There is a story on page 1 of this edition of the Star in connection with this item which I wish everybody would read.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Where does the gentleman say this room is located in which this picture was taken?

Mr. WILSON. Building H of the War Department at Twenty-second and C Streets NW.

Mr. STEFAN. Is that just a portion of the people referred to?

Mr. WILSON. That is just a small portion of the employees that were right within hearing distance.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman know how many of these young people have been brought here from the 48 States of the Union to wait around with nothing to do? How many of them there are; would the gentleman say there are several hundred?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; I would say there are more than a thousand in Washington now.

Mr. STEFAN. That does not speak very well for the efficiency of the personnel organizations in some of our departments. The gentlemen should take this up and get some explanation of it. It is a horrible thing.

Mr. WILSON. Of course, this is preliminary to asking the Congress for a committee to investigate this matter. However, since my initiation of this move, several Members of Congress who may at times be demagoging a little have used this particular critical situation to poke fun at my effort to do something about the situation in Washington.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Five or six of us went down to Leon Henderson's office, the Price Administrator, and out in the main office there were two fine looking young ladies sitting. One was smoking and reading the paper and the other was fixing her nails and lips. We waited out there for 5 or 10 minutes and during all that time they did not do anything. I do not know whether they were waiting for a bicycle ride or something else.

Mr. WILSON. The gentleman has not seen half what I have.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have too much work to do.

Mr. WILSON. I get down to the departments sometimes and I have to go back to my office and walk the floor, because I just cannot tolerate it. We are trying to win a war, and every dollar should produce its worth in "war effort."

Mr. HOFFMAN. You bring down a secretary or a stenographer who is competent and who is in the habit of working, and you let them associate with some of these Federal employees for 3 to 4 months and you will have a job on your hands to keep those folks that we brought from home from joining this movement for shorter hours, less work, and more pay.

Mr. WILSON. The papers have known about this for a long time, and I feel that they have been very kind toward me in my effort to uncover this thing. In my opinion, they are grasping the opportunity at this time to help me uncover all of this that I can. At least I have found them absolutely cooperative.

I have cut down a 2-hour speech to 30 minutes, and unless I can get additional time I will not much more than get started. I have some letters here confirming the picture in the Evening Star,

and from some of the very girls who are in that picture. I want to read you what they say:

Your statement accusing Government girls of inefficiency has been printed in almost every paper in the United States. It is true that time is being wasted, but I'm afraid you placed the blame on the wrong people.

I do not place the blame on those girls and I want that definitely understood. This is no fault of any Government worker in Washington. The fault is with the administrators.

Do you realize everyone in the United States now thinks that we are a bunch of lazy, inefficient goons?

No; I do not think so. I hope it is not true, because I am going to try to uncover the real people back of this, those who are responsible for this condition.

Eventually we will deteriorate to just that, but you have accused us too soon. I accepted the position and started to work for the War Department January 23. Every morning I have reported promptly for work at 8 a. m., incidentally with my make-up on, and I have had my breakfast.

Good.

My title is junior stenographer, and I have not seen a typewriter or even had a pencil in my hand. In short, there is nothing for me to do but write letters to my boy friend and read movie magazines. The people in charge tell me to not worry because I am being paid just the same as if I were being useful. Not one single bit of work has been assigned to me.

I wish I had time to read the whole letter.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Those people come before the Committee on Appropriations frequently, and they are coming before us now in connection with these various supply bills, people from the various departments, justifying appropriations for various things, especially personnel. I hope the gentleman is not picking out the War Department personnel especially in this statement that he is making.

Mr. WILSON. Absolutely not.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman's resolution to investigate these conditions passes, and if he happens to be a member of that committee, I hope he will make a special investigation as to the efficiency of the personnel organizations in the various departments of our Government, because if the personnel divisions are not efficient, the conditions which the gentleman has appraised the Congress of today will continue.

Mr. WILSON. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the testimony given before the Senate committee will show that the contractors have testified that literally thousands of so-called carpenters were hired to go on to these jobs and were permitted to go out and sleep all day, while continuing to collect

their full day's wages. That is in that part. The gentleman finds the trouble in this part. It does not make any difference what part of Government you go into today, you will find this same misdirected or unused wasted labor. When the gentleman gets his investigation started, he will certainly have some job on his hands to run it all down.

Mr. WILSON. I do not think I am capable of that job; in fact, I know I am not, but I am going to lend every ounce of ability and effort I have toward that end. I am not capable of carrying on an investigation such as is needed at this time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is just as capable as any of the rest of us.

Mr. WILSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The thing snowballs so fast that billions of dollars will be wasted that will go into the cost of the war.

Mr. WILSON. You remember France fell. Today we are to some extent carrying on in the same way France was carrying on behind the Maginot line just before she went down. Unless we get a dollar's worth of effort for every dollar spent, before we see the end of this war we shall be bankrupt; we shall have lots of workers and lots of houses and lots of money spent in that connection, but there will be none left to make guns and tanks and planes to win this war.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The gentleman is a member of the committee before which this morning we heard a request for additional housing facilities. The statement was made by a number of department heads that there would be approximately 4,000 to 5,000 people coming in each month for the next year, in addition to those now here. I am wondering if the gentleman in his investigation has checked the various departments as to whether or not those requests are outrageous.

Mr. WILSON. I have not made a thorough check but, on the basis of some things I have discovered, I am inclined to agree with my good friend from Ohio that many of these requests for additional help are outrageous.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. PRIEST]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that I come from Ohio. In Cleveland we have a Democratic newspaper, the Cleveland Plain Dealer. Last Sunday the Plain Dealer had this to say:

President Roosevelt is quoted as saying that there are too many unneeded persons in Washington, and he urges everyone in the Capital to ask himself: "Are you a parasite?" The President's point is well taken. But he himself could help alleviate the crowded

condition in Washington by abolishing many of the bureaus and agencies which are not needed to win the war, especially those who continue to promote the war against the American way of life.

They are the true parasites in Washington. So long as they remain, the Nation cannot be united as it should be for the greater effort. So long as they remain, we are in danger of losing the very thing we are fighting for in Asia and Europe and off the coasts of America.

I know the gentleman might have slipped in talking about a few of the cuties in Washington.

Mr. WILSON. Let me correct that statement. I have not made any reference whatever to any cutie in Washington except, perhaps, for one. I will admit I made one reference to the girl who had to type a letter three times before the one who dictated the letter would sign it. I said it may be that she was just a little bit woozy. However, I do not want to condemn even that girl for a single instance.

Mr. BENDER. I read in a Washington paper an article by a very nice-looking writer criticizing the gentleman for recommending a curfew. I am sure the gentleman did not intend to have a curfew for Washington girls.

Mr. WILSON. Certainly not; but I think the newspapers and writers have been very cooperative in getting this matter brought to light. I appreciate everything they have done. After all, you have to have a story, and it has to be a human-interest story, so people will read it. The writers have done a splendid job. I am guilty of some of the things they say I said, and maybe I can accept responsibility for all of them when I read about them.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. May I suggest to the gentleman that a lot of us are here to hear what the gentleman has to say. Will the gentleman now proceed without yielding for a few moments and give the Members the benefit of the information he has in his prepared speech?

Mr. WILSON. Thank you; I will proceed shortly. I have another letter here which contains this statement:

Some seem to think that the reason for more employees is that the "boss" has a better chance for promotion with a greater number of employees under supervision, and at higher salaries; also that this holds true with the one a step higher than the "boss."

I have been told on innumerable occasions by these girls—and if anyone wants to challenge this statement, I will try to bring some of them here to testify—that they have been told by their boss to let the mail pile up on their tables and accumulate, and for them to appear to be busy in order that the bosses can keep more of them on the pay roll and hold his job and maybe get an increase in salary.

I was called this morning by a lady who will bear this out. She said, "Mr. Wilson, I will give up my job and testify to this information if you need it. Yesterday the boss came down to me and

said, 'You know, I cannot get a thing done up in my department. The supervisors and the clerks are all knitting.'"

It seems that the girls in that office get rather disgusted over the set-up, but they do not have much choice about the matter; that if they reported it in any way it would just mean trouble for them.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. CREAL. In the suggested curfew for Government clerks or workers, why does not the gentleman include Members of Congress also?

Mr. WILSON. The gentleman will have that privilege.

I have another letter here that says:

I certainly agree with you that some deplorable conditions exist in the Government offices in Washington. Your remarks to the effect that there are more workers than work in some of the Government offices are daily being confirmed.

From a number of employees of the Reclamation Bureau comes reports of similar tone. At least this was the type of report coming from the stenographic office of that agency a month or two back. Also, reports were that work was manufactured to try and keep the girls busy, and the girls were instructed to make believe they were busy when anyone outside of the office came in.

I cannot read you half of these letters that I have here, and a number of people have come to me and testified before me. May I quote from another letter:

Congratulations, Old Boy! It takes a Hoosier to bring out the truth.

I have been employed in the War Department, Procurement Division, and I have seen many injustices. I have no one to blame but the chief clerks.

And that is exactly where the blame ought to be placed immediately.

The new girls come in and without exaggeration 70 percent of the girls have nothing to do all day.

Now, Members, that is the Procurement Division. Go down and investigate. You have a job here and I have given you the names. Then further the letter says:

We may be lucky to get one letter a day to retype and we may not. But we are told to write personal letters or do something else to appear busy.

I am not going to read any more of that, and here is one that I am not going to take up at all.

This curfew suggestion came up incidentally on some remarks on this bill and we initiated a lot of publicity. I received a poem Monday morning from a girl employed by our Government and I answered it that same day. I want to read you these poems. I believe they explain a lot.

ODE (?) TO MR. WILSON

I read with amazement
That failed to amuse,
Your untimely comments
On women's curfews.

'Tho I tried to be fair,
The more that I read
The more I was sure,
You were sadly misled.

And so I decided
 'Twas only your due,
 That someone like me,
 Should broaden your view.

The incentive to show
 Efficiency plus,
 Is killed in the struggle
 To get on a bus.

Nor can I believe that
 A ten-hour day
 Leaves Government girls
 Still ready for play.

Even women must eat
 (It's sad but it's true),
 And when we get home
 There's the cooking to do.

So how can you think
 There is time or ambition
 To gad late at night and
 Get out of condition?

And, besides—
 Since Washington women
 Outnumber the men,
 Just who is to keep us
 All out after ten?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

Here is my reply.

Young lady, I'm sorry you misunderstood! (However, it seems to be all to the good.) I was not impatient with girls who are working.

My patience is short with those who are shirking.

In winning a war, our hearts must be in it, So toll we must, every day, every minute. I mentioned your breakfasts, and caused quite a titter.

But if you will listen, you'll feel so much fitter.

Early to bed, and early to rise
 Will help your complexion, and brighten
 your eyes.

And coffee and rolls in your tummies by
 nine,
 Will make you feel healthier, frisky, and
 fine.

I'm not an old ogre who spoils girls' fun,
 I just see a job that has got to be done.
 The least you can do is to carry your share,
 When our boys are at work on the sea, land,
 and air

So, here's to a curfew, and feeling your best.
 The boys in the service will settle the rest.
 If you will agree to turn in at "taps",
 Your Uncle will check off the Germans and
 Japs.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest a 10-point plan to alleviate the congestion in Washington and to promote the national defense by establishing more decent living conditions for Government workers.

I have been grossly maligned and highly praised, too, for the suggestion which I made last Friday in a committee meeting of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, that perhaps we should adopt a curfew system for getting the inefficient Government girls in bed and thus guarantee that they could be on the job on time, fed, and ready for the kind of production that is required of us all in our effort to help win this war. Of course, as always, the whole truth would be tiresome and mundane, but that 10-o'clock curfew statement got attention, and I am perfectly willing that we all have a lot of laughs, and that I be called everything from a "grandpa" to a hick. Yes; anyone can go even

further than these if he, or in most cases she, chooses; if it will wake up only 50 percent of the army of workers now in Washington to the fact that some people are dragging their feet in our parade toward victory.

Let us not, any of us, be foolish enough to think that I suggested or would support a 10-o'clock curfew regulation just for the fun of making little girls cry, nor am I shortsighted or uninformed enough to think that such a personal matter could be legislated. I think that the general awareness of a condition that would provoke such a statement is all that is needed to get the results that Uncle Sam wants from his nieces and nephews who have the courage to reach for a pay check which, in some cases, they know they have not earned.

There is also another point in this connection which I should like to clear up. A few persons have inferred that I was making an attack on the moral character of those girls who work for the Government. Nothing could be farther from the truth. I have never thought of such a thing. I have never made such a statement or insinuation, and furthermore, I am certain that the truth is quite the opposite. Those men and women who work for Uncle Sam are, in my opinion, among the cream of the Nation's crop, mentally and morally. Those few who have attempted to read such derogatory remarks into the true record of my statements have been talking on levels beneath the dignity of refutation.

At the outset, may I say that the problem before us is of sufficient magnitude as to challenge the best of each and every one of us. That problem is the winning of this war. Beautiful words about ourselves, bold remarks hurled at the enemy, or promises of what will be done, can contribute little toward our objective. We must have results and I feel that we owe it to the boys in uniform to get results in the production of mechanized equipment with which they are going to defend their lives and ours. We will not let them down.

We have been hearing a lot about blood, tears, toil, and sweat, and now it is time we were making our contribution. The greater and the sooner our contribution the less will be the demand on our brothers, sons, and fathers now fighting on a dozen fronts in a world torn by the horrors of war.

The subject I am about to discuss came up in connection with an authorization to appropriate \$50,000,000 for defense housing and facilities in the District of Columbia. Therefore, I believe I should say just a few words about appropriations already made for vital defense needs.

The Seventy-seventh Congress has set a record, not only for the United States but for the world, in the appropriation of money. On Friday, January 23, Congress passed the largest appropriation bill in the history of the world, twelve and one-half billion dollars for defense purposes. Tuesday, January 27, that record was broken when the House of Representatives passed a new appropriation bill amounting to seventeen and one-half billion dollars, authorizing in

addition something like three and one-half billions in contract obligations which, if used, would make the appropriation over \$20,000,000,000.

It may help you to understand the size of these appropriations to remind you that during the first 100 years of our national history, during which time we fought a war with England, the Mexican War, 4 years of Civil War, and the various Indian wars, all appropriations by the Federal Government totaled only \$9,000,000,000. Since July 1, 1940, Congress has appropriated over \$107,000,000,000 for Army and Navy purposes. This is equal to about \$900 for every man, woman, and child in the United States, and the end is not yet.

So, as far as appropriating money for national defense and for the war effort is concerned, this Congress has gone all out. Now, it is up to those of us who are working for the Government and for the taxpayers to go all out in our efforts to get the maximum amount of good out of every dollar spent. Yes; and what is more important, it is our God-given, patriotic duty to strain every muscle and squeeze 60 minutes out of every hour in our efforts to provide those men in khaki and blue, who are fighting our battle, with the necessary implements to protect their lives and our Republic. The sweat-streaked, battle-scarred men in the hellholes of Luzon Island are not working from 9 to 5. They are on duty with their lives, 24 hours a day, at \$21 a month. If we, safe in the confines of our free Republic, should ever entertain the thought of doing less than they, we should not be worthy of their protection.

The District of Columbia is already crowded to overflowing. Your public facilities are overtaxed by the sudden influx of workers. There are not sufficient living quarters for those already here and yet we are told that within the next few months we must expect several thousand more defense workers in Washington. I am told that in the month of December, the War Department alone, hired 3,577 clerical employees in Washington, and the enormous rate of hiring is being continued. Since Pearl Harbor, it is estimated that 7,500 new employees have been brought here. From these figures and from the fact that there are more to come, it should be apparent that your problem is not only tremendous but acute. The Federal Government must and will help solve this problem, but it is the duty of Congress and my Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, in particular, to see that it is solved with the minimum amount of trouble and expense to the taxpayers.

It is with that thought in mind that I am attempting to awaken you Government workers, men as well as women, to the urgent need for the utmost efficiency in the dispatch of your duties.

It is my contention that if those of us who are already here will do a full and efficient day's work; if we will not occupy any more living space than is necessary, and if those departments of the Government not necessary to the prosecution of this war are reduced and the personnel placed in defense jobs, we can greatly reduce the number of additional workers

needed and save our Government thousands, perhaps millions, of dollars in the building of houses and facilities.

In the solution of this problem I would like to submit to you a 10-point program which if diligently carried out, will, I believe, meet with the approval of most of you, add greatly to the efficiency of our Government, and contribute immeasurably to the successful prosecution of this all-important war effort.

First. I would suggest the removal of employees from overstaffed departments. This particularly applies to peacetime departments. I have been informed by many patriotic employees that there are many Government departments where the work could easily be done in a small fraction of the space now used and by a small fraction of the staff now employed. These workers have told me on different occasions that the days were long and tiresome to them sitting around with nothing to do. Also, they have said that their supervisors wanted to keep them on the pay roll for fear of losing their jobs or having their salaries cut. I agree with my good friend and colleague, Congressman RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, that most of the employees are 100 percent patriotic and would rather be contributing their all to national defense. Several employees have testified that their bosses have instructed them to let their work pile up so they can appear busy at all times and have something to do. In this case, I would say the workers are more loyal to their country than their bosses are. I have letters in my mail which will bear me out and should demand an immediate investigation. I am sure that these letters only disclose conditions which are equally true in many other instances.

Second. I would suggest the removal of inefficient employers and employees, and promotion on the basis of merit only. Again, I agree with my colleague, Congressman RANDOLPH, that most girls and boys are patriotic and efficient. It is not these who object to my criticism of late. Not at all. They, being patriotic, want to see our national defense program go forward with maximum efficiency. They, being patriotic, want to give their all in effort that their loved ones on the battlefields all over the world may have those things so badly needed to defend their lives and ours. Being patriotic, they are demanding the same efficiency of those less interested, regardless of what the cause may be. They are demanding a dollar's worth of war effort for every dollar spent.

So, you can see that those people who are crying are those on whose toes such a suggestion treads, even though it be lightly. It is only the parasites who object to a program of efficiency and economy. It is now, and will be throughout the existence of man, the human tendency to do little more than is demanded of us. Therefore, I do not blame the girls altogether for "working" the Government, nor those who come to work sleepy-eyed, without "their breakfast down," or their "make-up on." Whenever you find a group of girls, or boys for that matter, you will find a few of this type. This does not mean, in any sense, that they are not patriotic. It merely

means that their employers, their department supervisors are inefficient and are not able to handle this administrative problem.

Third. I would suggest that preliminary training for defense workers be done in some nearby city. I do not see why this could not be done away from Washington as well as here. Probably our business colleges could be moved to a nearby city and given the problem of training Government employees. At present, thousands are being brought here to add to an already overpopulated and overcrowded area.

Fourth. I would suggest that there be a doubling up of shifts. If we could use our office space for two or three shifts a day instead of one, we would not need to put so much money into additional office space and equipment.

Fifth. If we would remove the parasites from the District as the President has suggested, we would have room for those people whom we really need and who are willing and able to do a full and productive day's work. Right here I would like to suggest my definition of a Washington parasite. It is any individual sapping the lifeblood of our Capital City, our National Government, and our defense program, without giving the equivalent in war effort. This means all those people not doing defense work or rendering a service to defense workers.

Sixth. I would suggest that all available space in private homes and apartments be made available to defense workers. This should apply to Members of Congress as well as to others. I am sure that many thousands of workers could be comfortably cared for in the unused portions of some of the lavish apartments now being wasted by the parasites.

Seventh. I would suggest that the Government commandeer all clubhouses not being used for defense purposes and utilize them for office space or to house defense workers.

Eighth. I would suggest that the long-delayed mass decentralization of Government agencies be put into effect. It is generally agreed that there are many agencies that could operate just as efficiently somewhere outside Washington. This would make available to national defense agencies some much-needed office space. Also, the workers could be transferred to defense work if they wished to remain in Washington. Thus, we would eliminate part of the necessity of bringing in more. However, if these workers preferred to go along with their old agency, their living quarters and other facilities would be available for those coming into the District.

Ninth. I suggest that all available help now living in Washington be urged into service or asked to leave the city. By this suggestion, I mean use every wife or husband of a necessary worker, and the calling back to duty of retired civil-service employees. This would save the need of bringing in someone else and would be most valuable in conserving living quarters. I really believe that this suggestion would take care of a sizable portion of our problem.

And last, I recommend a substantial building program. The tearing down of the semislum section just to the east and

south of the Capitol, and the wholesale building of small, but convenient, apartments which would house only people working on Capitol Hill. Also the building of a similar section in the south and west for the convenience of workers in the downtown agencies. Make these buildings real additions to the beauty and utility of our Capital City, and not the eyesores of which you are probably thinking. We could encourage the people working in a certain area to live in an adjacent area, and thus we would have greatly alleviated our traffic problem. It seems perfectly sensible to me that people would want to live near their work, and not have to criss-cross the city morning and night and add hours to their working day getting back and forth.

After all, we are at war. That is no fault of yours, or of mine, or of any other good American citizen. We place that blame directly on the Axis Powers, particularly on Hitler, and immediately on Japan, for her dastardly sneak attack. We were at one time divided on the question as to how to preserve peace, we are now 100 percent united in the fact that we must fight for peace. Just how long, how bloody, or how costly this struggle is going to be, we do not know, and we are not going to argue. Whatever the price, we must pay it for a free Republic.

In conclusion, and back to the bone of contention, the only regulation that might come of this suggestion would be a more or less self-imposed honor system curfew for the duration. Under this system, a Government worker, man or woman, who turned in a shabby day's work, or in other words, did not earn his or her salt, would be handed a small card by the supervisor of the department bearing the word "parasite." The employee receiving such a card would know by that reminder that he or she would be expected to improve his work or at the end of a set period of time he would receive an appropriate cut in salary, or be demoted from his present duties.

The demand that would be made by this method for each person to carry his share of the load, would step up our production in offices and on typewriters the same as production has been stepped up on assembly lines and on punch presses.

Yours for victory, and—remember Pearl Harbor.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ARENDS, on account of death in family.

To Mr. FOLGER, indefinitely, on account of brother.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on one topic, and on another to include a statement from the Tax Commission of the State of Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 4, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Public Health of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, February 4, 1942, to hold a hearing on H. R. 5674, a bill to protect the public health by the prevention of certain practices leading to dental disorders and to prevent the circumvention of certain State laws regulating the practice of dentistry.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10 a. m., Wednesday, February 4, 1942, continuation of hearings on H. R. 1844.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on Wednesday, February 4, 1942, at 10 a. m., to consider all bills now pending before this committee.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 5, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 6020, granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 12, 1942, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 263, to provide decorations for outstanding conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, February 17, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 6503, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1368 A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on a list of papers recommended to the Archivist for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1369 A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Chairman of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting a report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941

(H. Doc. No. 607); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. House Resolution 162 (77th Cong., 1st sess.). Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the national defense program; without amendment (Rept. No. 1735). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1945. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, operate, and regulate public off-street parking facilities, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1736). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2182. An act to provide for temporary promotion in the Army of the United States of officers commissioned in the Air Corps or assigned to duty with the Air Corps; with amendment (Rept. No. 1737). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 6496. A bill to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House joint resolution 276. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to render financial aid to China, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1739). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SCRUGHAM: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 6460. A bill making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1740). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEITER:

H. R. 6521. A bill to extend certain benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 6522. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent speculation in lands in the Columbia Basin prospectively irrigable by reason of the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam project and to aid actual settlers in securing such lands at the fair appraised value thereof as arid land, and for other purposes" (act of May 27, 1937, 50 Stat. 208), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 6523. A bill to allow an additional period of 6 months in which certain members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Enlisted

Reserve Corps of the Army or their beneficiaries may make claim for benefits under the act of July 18, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 6524. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind," approved March 3, 1931, as amended; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 6525. A bill to provide compensation for personnel sustaining disease or injury while performing civilian defense duty, and to provide indemnities to the beneficiaries of such personnel in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. J. Res. 277. Joint resolution to name the new Army air base at Greenville, S. C., the John J. McSwain Air Base; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 428. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate the Activities of the Farm Security Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 429. Resolution to provide for expenses of investigation authorized by House Resolution 428, a resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate the Activities of the Farm Security Administration; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2362. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Petitions of Richard B. Ott, commander; Fred M. Fueker, department adjutant of the Department of Washington, American Legion, in behalf of the department executive committee, Department of Washington, American Legion, urging that the Office of Civilian Defense be administered through and under the jurisdiction of the War Department; also a resolution asserting that Gen. Douglas MacArthur and his heroic troops have gained invaluable time for the United Nations and for what must be our ultimate effort; and, therefore, expressing deep admiration for the valiant and heroic stand of General MacArthur and his men; also resolution alleging that the best defense is a good offense; insisting that too much emphasis on defense measures tends to take the public mind from what must be America's primary objective; and, therefore, asserting we should encourage the suspension for the duration of all thought of self or group interests, that we should work for the development of America on the offensive, and that our fighting forces should be equipped, supplied, and protected in taking this war to the enemy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2363. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the board of supervisors, Los Angeles County, Calif., urging the Federal Government to provide housing and sustenance for Japanese residents of the county who would otherwise become charges of the county, and to transfer Japanese aliens inland to keep them away from vital industries on the coast; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2364. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, respectfully urging the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the Director of the Office of Production Management, and the Chairman of the War Production Board, to provide immediately for the completion of the

all-American canal to Coachella Valley at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2365. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, urging the Government of the United States, through the appropriate agency, to make an immediate survey of the best available route to bring water from the Colorado River to the city of San Diego for the purpose of insuring adequate water supply which is vital to the war program and to the welfare of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps stationed in the Nation's most vital defense area; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2366. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, requesting the Federal employees retirement system initiate and the Congress of the United States enact legislation which will provide for employees of the State of California, who for years have been employees of the State, and who earned retirement rights by their service with the State, and who, by Presidential order, were made Federal employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2367. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, respectfully urging Congress and the President of the United States that they consider the necessity of the food industry during the war effort and that proper steps be taken to insure the industry that the draft law will not use up the personnel of the industry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2368. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, respectfully urging the President and Congress to amend the Federal Social Security Act by repealing amendments of 1939 thereto which prevent any State in the Union from allowing any additional income to the aged and to children beneficiaries thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2369. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, expressing its desire to do everything possible in the interest of successful military offensive by the United States of America, and urging Congress to provide necessary funds for the construction of needed defense projects relating directly to the Sacramento River and tributaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2370. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of California, requesting the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to cause an immediate study of the defense project known as the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor Breakwater, such study to be made by appropriate defense authorities, and to consider favorably the speeding up of said project; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2371. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, urging the President and Congress to consider and enact such amendments to the Federal Social Security Act as may be necessary to restore to the recipients of old-age assistance their former privilege of earning not more than \$15 per month without deduction from the amount of old-age assistance which they would otherwise receive; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2372. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, urging the President and Congress to take such steps as will give the gold-mining industry sufficient materials, and priorities thereto, to permit its continued operation through the war emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2373. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the California Retail Grocers and Merchants Association, Ltd., San Francisco, Calif., opposing the plan advanced by the Social Security Board for the taking over of the California

Unemployment insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2374. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the executive council, Wisconsin Bankers Association, and midwinter conference, Wisconsin Bankers' Association, that the President of the United States and each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Wisconsin be petitioned that proposed legislation in regard to Federal-State relationship in unemployment compensation to the end that 51 separate State and Territorial laws be destroyed and 1 Federal law substituted, to be deferred for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, grant that our sympathies, supplications, and our sacrifices may be an inspirational might to our defenders on land, sea, and air; defend the sanctities of our faith with the assurance that our hope in them is neither a delusion nor fiction. As we lift our souls to Thee, we pray that their hearts may not be troubled, neither let them be afraid. For life's transitions, for its varying experiences, and for the path they need not tread alone, be their comfort beneath that guardian Rock where all commotions rest.

The recurrent sense of human frailty feelingly reminds us of the danger in which we walk. We pray to be made stronger, possessing the truth, clearly discerned, with our souls anchored to constant and unmovable foundations. With contrite hearts and with that grace which fortifies the soul, we beseech Thee that we may have an urgent determination to remember the blessing of sanctified duty. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 257. An act for the relief of Edna La Blanche Gillette;

H. R. 1903. An act for the relief of Reuben Owen;

H. R. 1914. An act for the relief of the Coppel Coal Co.;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of Paul E. Cook;

H. R. 2376. An act for the relief of Ethel Ray Sowder;

H. R. 3118. An act for the relief of the State compensation insurance fund of California;

H. R. 3403. An act for the relief of Louis M. McDougal;

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of Mollie S. McHaney;

H. R. 4436. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bertha M. Smith;

H. R. 5046. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Saunders;

H. R. 5085. An act for the relief of Esco Wood;

H. R. 5164. An act for the relief of Arthur W. Jorgenson, and the legal guardian of Robert R. Jorgenson, a minor;

H. R. 5291. An act for the relief of Helen Rauch and Max Rauch;

H. R. 5390. An act for the relief of G. T. Elliott, Inc.;

H. R. 5541. An act for the relief of Joseph Keeney;

H. R. 5701. An act for relief of the accounts of Lt. Col. Joseph M. Kelly, United States property and disbursing officer for Kentucky;

H. R. 5767. An act for the relief of A. Paul Johnson; and

H. R. 6356. An act to amend the act approved October 24, 1941, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes" (Public Law No. 280, 77th Cong.), so as to remove the limitation on the sum authorized to be appropriated annually to effectuate the purposes of the act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2183. An act for the relief of Hiram O. Lester, Grace D. Lester, and Florence E. Dawson;

H. R. 2712. An act for the relief of the Branchland Pipe & Supply Co.; and

H. R. 2780. An act for the relief of O. C. Ousley.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 984. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James C. Loard;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Eugene Jackson;

S. 1820. An act for the relief of Jerry McKinley Thompson;

S. 1898. An act for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Nazaria Garcia, of Winslow, Ariz.;

S. 2002. An act for the relief of Donald William Burt;

S. 2066. An act to make permanently effective the act regulating interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products;

S. 2198. An act to provide for the financing of the War Damage Corporation to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Report of the Commission Appointed by the President of the United States To Investigate the Facts Relating to the Attack Made by the Japanese Armed Forces Upon Pearl Harbor in the Territory of Hawaii, on December 7, 1941.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2112. An act authorizing overtime pay for certain employees of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Labor.
2. Department of War.